TYPICAL CHARACTER

OF THE

Old and New Dispensations.

BY THE LATE

JOHN BEVERIDGE.

EDITED BY H. F. HOYT.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
COPYRIGHT.
JUL 23 1883
No. 10295-0
CITY OF WASHINGTON.

RICHMOND, VA.:
WHITTET & SHEPPERSON.
1883.

BS 511
.B45

COPYRIGHT, 1883,
BY
H. F. HOYT.

Printed by
Whittet & Shepperson,
Richmond, Va.

TYPICAL CHARACTER

OF THE

OLD AND NEW DISPENSATIONS,

IN THEIR RELATION TO

THE VISIBLE AND INVISIBLE KINGDOMS OF CHRIST,

IN FOUR PARTS.

PART I.—The Lord's Day and not the Jewish Sabbath.

PART II.—The Pharisee and the Publican; or Man's Duty to Man.

PART III.—The Lord's Miracles.

PART IV.—Sermons.

CONTENTS.

Page.

SKETCH OF THE AUTHOR'S LIFE, ... 1

PART FIRST.

THE LORD'S DAY, AND NOT THE JEWISH SABBATH.

Introduction.—There is no command to observe the Jewish Sabbath before the Exodus from Egypt.—Institution of the Jewish Sabbath.—The prophetic significance of the Jewish Sabbath in the desert.—Confirmation of the Jewish Sabbath in the giving of the law.—If the Jewish Sabbath is transferred to the Christian system, we are morally bound to keep it as the Jews were required to do.—The Sabbath made for man, and not man for the Sabbath.—The New Covenant not a patch on an old garment.—An incontrovertible argument.—The Jewish type fulfilled in the Christian antitype.—"There remaineth therefore a rest for the people of God," is not alone a rest in heaven, but a rest of grace here on earth.—What relation does the Lord's Day bear to the rest of the New Covenant?—The Jewish Pentecost a germ of the Lord's Day.—The Christian Lord's Day an outgrowth of the New Covenant System.—The Lord's Day more holy than the Jewish Sabbath.—The Jewish Sabbath a symbol of death; the Lord's Day a symbol of life.—The Jewish Sabbath a symbol of darkness; the Lord's Day a symbol of light.—The proper observance of the Lord's Day may be learned from the prophets as well as from the Mosaic law.—The proper observance of the Lord's Day.—The Lord's Day a day of intense activity.—"Sunday" an appropriate name for the Lord's Day.—Review and Conclusion. . pp. 9–115

PART SECOND.

THE PHARISEE AND THE PUBLICAN.

CHRIST'S SERMON ON THE SECOND TABLE OF THE LAW, OR MAN'S DUTY TO MAN.

	Page.
The Preface,	118
The Lost Sheep,	124
The Lost Piece of Money,	131
The Prodigal Son,	147
The Elder Brother,	173
The Children of the Church,	183
Did the Elder Brother Repent?	193
The Unrighteous Steward,	206
The Rich Man and Lazarus,	217
Application,	235
Conclusion,	242

PART THIRD.

THE LORD'S MIRACLES.

1. Water turned into Wine,	247
2. The Miraculous Draught of Fishes,	266
3. Christ Stilling the Tempest,	276
4. Healing the Demoniac,	284
5. Jairus' Daughter Raised, and	315
6. The Issue of Blood Stopped,	
7. The Healing of the Paralytic,	333
8. A Leper Cured,	345
9. The Centurion's Servant,	353
10. Miracle at the Pool of Bethesda,	360
11. The Five Thousand Fed,	371
12. Christ Walking on the Sea,	385
13. Christ Healing a Blind Man,	393
14. Restoring the Withered Hand,	402
15. The Ten Lepers,	409
16. The Syrophenician Woman,	416
17. The Lunatic Child,	423

Page.
18. The Stater in the Fish's Mouth, ... 433
19. Raising of Lazarus, ... 440
20. The Last Miracle, ... 456

PART FOURTH.

SERMONS.

1. Samson, a Champion of the Law, . . . 479
2. David, a Champion of the Gospel, . . . 486
3. Joshua's Conquest of Canaan, ... 491
4. Original Sin; Second Part of Joshua's Conquest, . 496
5. Melchisedec, ... 502
6. Christ a King, ... 506
7. Our High Priest.—No. 1, ... 511
8. The Great High Priest.—No. 2, ... 519
9. The Laborers in the Vineyard, ... 525

SKETCH OF THE AUTHOR'S LIFE.

Birth and Early Education.

REV. JOHN BEVERIDGE was born in Shelby county, Ohio, of pious parents, whose humble circumstances enabled them to give him no higher advantages of education than such as the common schools afforded. His education, beyond the mere rudiments, was obtained by his own unwearied efforts, perseverance, and energy.

Early Struggles.

About the time he arrived at man's estate, he drifted eastward, and became a resident of the city of New York. Uniting with one of the Presbyterian churches of that city, he went vigorously to work, and became at once an efficient and zealous laborer in the Sunday-school cause. Feeling that he was called to the ministry, he set about to secure the requisite education. With this object in view, he made application to the late Hon. Wm. E. Dodge for means to assist him in prosecuting his studies. He felt encouraged to make this application on account of the well-known liberality of that generous philanthropist, who frequently rendered such assistance to poor young men. In their interview Mr.

Dodge questioned him closely in regard to his physical condition and state of health, and then, detecting, as he thought, signs of that insidious destroyer, consumption, he kindly declined the desired assistance, and advised him to abandon all thought of entering the ministry, and to devote himself to some more active employment as the only hope of prolonging his life. Thrown thus upon his own resources, with that strength of will which characterized him, Mr. Beveridge resolved to surmount every obstacle by his own unaided efforts. For this purpose he learned the art of wood engraving, by means of which he supported himself while devoting his spare moments to his studies.

Goes to South America.

Having acquired great skill as a wood engraver, and thus secured the means of self-support, he resolved to go to South America in order to perfect his knowledge of the Spanish language. While there, with characteristic zeal, he engaged in missionary work, laboring at first in connection with a mission of the Methodist Church, and then with one of the Church of England. He also engaged in the publication of a newspaper in the Spanish language, which he embellished with wood cuts of his own skilful production. For several years, with unwearied energy and industry, he continued its successful issue, vigorously assailing the errors of Roman Catholicism, and disseminating the principles of Protestantism.

In 1869 he returned to this country, entered Lane

Seminary, where he completed his theological course, was ordained to the ministry by the Presbytery of Cincinnati, and under the auspices of the American and Foreign Christian Union, was sent as a

Missionary to Mexico.

The Mission with which he was connected was shortly afterward transferred to the care of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. Numerous letters from his friends and co-laborers testify to the ability, zeal, and success with which he labored while thus employed. His work in Mexico, however, was of short duration. In less than five years it was brought to a close by his failing health. That fatal disease which Mr. Dodge had foreseen and predicted years before, and the dark shadow of which had hung over him all his life, now began to develop itself. On this account he was compelled to leave the Mission, and to return in 1875 to the United States.

Coming to the South,

He fixed his residence at Cuthbert, Ga. Here his health was so far restored that he felt that he could again enter upon the active work of the ministry. For this purpose he decided to go to Florida, as presenting an inviting field of usefulness, and hoping that its mild climate would serve still further to restore his shattered health.

He labored first at Freeport, in West Florida, and then settled in Orlando, in Orange county, as pastor of the Presbyterian church. In addition to his min-

isterial labors, he became a constant contributor to a newspaper, furnishing various articles on scientific, literary, and religious topics. The sprightly style of his writing, together with his varied and useful information, and his extensive and accurate knowledge of the different countries he had visited, gave to these articles a charm that won the admiration of numerous readers.

One of them thus writes to the editor: "I began to read a little carelessly the articles by Mr. Beveridge, now and then questioning a little his meteorology, chemistry, and geology, but soon came to have more respect for his assertions, as I found him knowing so much more of these subjects than I could ever hope to know. But his theology has most interested me, showing the man in his best character, and furnishing weekly an intellectual table that should fully satisfy the mental appetites of those who have the good fortune to receive your paper."

Another, an editor of a journal in a distant city, says of them: "*The Orange County Reporter* should 'make up' in book form, and 'strike off' enough for an edition of a thousand copies, the serial articles from the pen of Rev. John Beveridge, artist and traveller. They are very interesting, and of much scientific value." The first part of this volume, on *The Lord's Day*, forms a portion of this series of articles.

Another admirer, a member of a different church from his own, pays him the following compliment: "Mr. Beveridge is a deep thinker, and a bold, eloquent, earnest speaker, attacking error wherever met,

whether in the translation of the Bible or the commentaries."

Health Fails Again.

His labors were again interrupted by the utter breaking down of his health. A severe hemorrhage from the lungs completely prostrated him, and threatened the speedy termination of his life. Saying, with Paul, "the time of my departure is at hand," he immediately set about arranging his temporal affairs to that end. Having no family or near relatives to provide for, his only earthly ambition seemed to be to provide for the publication of two books,—the result of his life's labors; by means of which he hoped to do good, and accomplish something for the Master's glory after his death. Having settled his affairs in Orlando, he returned to Cuthbert in the spring of 1881, saying to his friends, that he had "come back to die." He, however, rallied again, and, as his strength permitted, continued his work upon his books, one of which was still in an unfinished state. Almost to the very last he persevered in these labors; and when from failing strength he could do no more, he committed his unfinished work into the hands of the writer, with instructions to complete it, and to publish the two books as soon as the necessary means could be obtained. This sacred trust, committed to him by the dying lips of this servant of God, the writer now fulfils. The incompleted work, to the best of his ability, has been finished, and is now given to the public. The remaining book, according to the directions of the author, is shortly to

follow. What the verdict of the reading world in regard to them is to be, yet remains to be seen. If they accomplish good, the author's hope will be realized.

Falls Asleep in Jesus.

Having disposed of this matter, in full possession of his mental faculties, and without a shadow or a cloud to interrupt the sun-light of God's presence, on the morning of February 18th, 1882, he sweetly fell asleep in Jesus.

As a Writer,

Mr. Beveridge was a bold, independent, original thinker. He certainly had learned to "call no man master." He was no imitator. His books, whatever merit or demerit they may possess, certainly have the charm of originality. His readers or hearers were never invited to a re-hash of other men's ideas. He thought for himself, and was never afraid to trust his own conclusions. The Presbytery of Macon, in its memorial of him, speaks of him as "a man of fervent piety and remarkable mental activity; original and independent in thought, very confident of the correctness of his own views, however they might differ from those commonly accepted." This is a correct and truthful picture.

As a Christian,

he was characterized by earnestness, zeal, and untiring activity in his efforts to do good, and by the most unshaken confidence in the truths of God's word.

He was no idler in the Lord's vineyard. From the moment he gave himself to the Master's work, his earnest desire and constant aim was to be useful. "To do good and to communicate," was an injunction of the apostle he never forgot. Nothing but the palsy of death could stay his active mind and busy hands from working for his Master's cause. The confidence of his faith in the plain teachings of God's word is illustrated by the following incident: While in Florida he was challenged by a noted Universalist to a public discussion of the doctrine of future punishment. His reply was characteristic. After declining on the score of bad health to accept the challenge, he adds: "I cannot say, however, that I take a deep interest in the subject of eternal punishment, feeling, as I do, that the absolute sovereignty of God gives Him the right to do what He will with His own creation, and His infinite justice will not permit Him to impose upon the wicked one single ounce of punishment more than they rightfully deserve. My mission is to warn sinners to 'flee from the wrath to come.'"

This confidence did not forsake him when tested by his last hours of weakness and suffering, and the near approach of death. He could still say with the Apostle Paul, "I *know* whom I have believed, and am persuaded that He is able to keep that which I have committed unto Him against that day."

H. F. H.

PART FIRST.

THE LORD'S DAY, AND NOT THE JEWISH SABBATH.

Introduction.

IT has long been a disputed point among Christians whether the Lord's day, commonly called the Christian Sabbath, is, or is not, a transfer of the Jewish Sabbath into the Christian or New Covenant system, merely changing the day of the week and suppressing the death penalty attached to it under the Old Covenant. At the present time, a large majority of evangelical Christians firmly believe that the Jewish Sabbath has been transferred to the Christian system, while a very small minority believe the Lord's day to be an institution peculiar to the New Covenant, and an outgrowth of the New Testament system, similar to the gospel ministry, and in intimate connexion with it, and yet no more of a transfer of the Jewish Sabbath than the gospel ministry is a transfer of the Levitical priesthood; both of these being but a shadow or prophecy of the corresponding institutions of the New Covenant.

The author of the following articles, after a careful examination of the claims of both parties, has decided in favor of the minority, finding himself fully convinced that they are in possession of the truth. He

cordially invites fair and honest criticism, either to confirm him in the truth, or clearly indicate where his line of argument departs from the solid basis of the inspired oracles. From all those critics who condemn without examination, merely because his views are not those of the majority of professing Christians, or not in accordance with the opinions of illustrious teachers who are as liable to error as himself, he asks no sympathy, and expects none from that Judaizing class who are ever ready to exclaim: "Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved." To the cause of truth the condemnation of such men is far preferable to their praise.

On referring to the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church, it will be observed that the Westminster divines left the question undecided. It says: "The fourth commandment requireth of all men the sanctifying or keeping holy to God such set times as He hath appointed in His word, expressly one whole day in seven; which was the seventh from the beginning of the world to the resurrection of Christ, and the first day of the week ever since, and so to continue to the end of the world; which is the Christian Sabbath, and in the New Testament called the Lord's day." The designation "Christian Sabbath" here, would indicate a distinction between this and the Jewish Sabbath.

In accepting the position that the Lord's day is not a transfer of the Jewish Sabbath, the author has the satisfaction of knowing that he has at least one illustrious Presbyterian in his favor—John Calvin.

Calvin says: "If superstition is dreaded, there was

more danger in keeping the Jewish Sabbath than the Lord's day, as Christians now do. It being expedient to overthrow superstition, the Jewish holy day was abolished; and as a thing necessary to retain decency, order, and peace in the Church, *another day* was appointed for that purpose." (*Calvin's Institutes*, Book 2, Chap. 8, Sec. 33.) Calvinists of the present day appear to have departed from the views of Calvin, probably owing to the loose manner in which the Lord's day is observed in those portions of Continental Europe where the Reformation was first established by Calvin and Luther. It is usually supposed that these views lead to a disrespect of the Lord's day, and consequently should be deprecated. This is not right. We should not depart from the truth of God's word because ignorant or wicked men abuse it. The author of these articles would not detract one particle from the proper observance of the Lord's day, as required by the sacred Scriptures, and would rejoice to see the day observed and respected far more than it is, by the great majority of evangelical Christians of the present day; his only object in presenting his views to the world being a desire to know and teach the truth as revealed by God's word, and not erroneous views based upon human prejudice or tradition. But was Calvin right? Were his views of the Lord's day in accordance with Scripture? Was he not in error on this point? Have not his disciples become wiser than their teacher? It is hoped that these questions may be answered satisfactorily in this investigation.

The author has chosen as a clear exposition of the

views he combats, a prize essay entitled "The Holy Sabbath," and published by the "Presbyterian Committee of Publication," from which he has taken the liberty of making frequent extracts. In doing this, he wishes to say that he has no desire to depreciate his brethren in the ministry, but, by pointing out their errors, he would desire that we may all grow in knowledge as well as in grace, till we arrive "in the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ," and by "speaking the truth in love, we may grow up into Him in all things."

There is no Command Given to Men to Observe the Jewish Sabbath Before the Exodus from Egypt.

The first record we have of the seventh day is in connection with the creation of the world. "And on the seventh day God ended His work which He had made; and He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it He had rested from all His work which God created and made." (Gen. ii. 2, 3.) There is certainly no command here to man to keep the day holy. This is merely an historical record, telling us that God rested after completing the work of creation. Nor are we told how long He rested. Did He rest one day of twenty-four hours, and then resume the work of creation? No one will answer this in the affirmative. Did He on the eighth day resume the work of supporting and sustaining the creation which He had

made? If so, what became of the creation on the seventh day? It is universally admitted that, were God to withdraw His sustaining power from the universe but for a single moment, it would be utterly annihilated. This power, then, was exercised on the seventh day, according to our Saviour's words: "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work."

We find ourselves, then, compelled to accept the conclusion that the seventh day, or day following the six days of creation, was not a literal day of twenty-four hours, but a period—a day in creation's history, reaching from the end of the six days in which creation was brought into existence, down to the morning of redemption, when a still more holy day was ushered in.

Now, as geologists have proved as clearly that the world was not created in six literal days, as geographers have that the world is a globe, and not an extended plain, and the Church universal has accepted this view (except a few, who would have us believe that God created the world, with its great mountain ranges, largely composed of countless millions of sea-shells, which would be as absurd as to suppose that He created the pyramids of Egypt in the same way, only to try men's faith), we can have no doubt but the seventh day is a period reaching from the time when He created man, and that then looking upon everything that He had made, He pronounced it good, down to that hour when the work of redemption was completed, and the Second Adam exclaimed from the cross, "It is finished."

We are told that at the commencement of this

period, "God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it He had rested from all His work which God created and made," and then, towards its close, prophecy points forward to its termination, and says: "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy." (Dan. ix. 24.)

"God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it." He blessed and sanctified it in an especial manner. The six periods in which God created all things were but preliminary to that period in which man should dwell upon earth. He blessed it by walking with man in the beginning, and sanctified it by coming Himself clothed in human flesh to redeem man from the curse of the fall. God blessed and sanctified the seventh day of the world's creation; but does this prove that He commanded man to observe the seventh day of the week?

There is absolutely no command given to men in the Bible to observe the seventh day of the week before the exodus from Egypt, nor is there any passage of Scripture from which such an inference can be derived; and any assertion to the contrary is pure assumption. If any such command had been given, Moses would certainly have recorded it; or are we to assume that he did record it, and that the Jews lost it out of the Bible? Give us proofs, and we will believe them; but mere assertions without proof

are of no value. To assert that "the great Creator should in some way demand of His creatures a formal acknowledgment of their fealty to His throne; that He should seek to bind them to Himself by levying a tribute upon their love and affection; that He should appoint a place and designate a time when He would condescend to meet them, and graciously admit them to communion with Himself; that He should select for this purpose the day of His resting from His creative work; and that He should hallow the day thus selected, by separating it from all the rest, and making it holy as He is holy, that it might thus ever stand as a perpetual witness for Him," would be all well and good, if we had any proof to that effect. To assert that God would not abandon His creatures without giving them the Sabbath day from the beginning, merely because our finite views thus deal with His character, would also assert that a holy God would not abandon His creatures to sin. The latter we know is not true, and the former is equally deficient of proof. It has no basis in Scripture, and to our own finite reasoning we have no right to appeal.

We know that God walked with the patriarchs, and no doubt taught them to obey His will by verbal communications; and we also know that He had His servants who, like Noah, were preachers of righteousness, or, in other words, teachers of the moral law; and thus have good reason to infer that He required of His children a proper portion of their time in consecration to Himself, a first fruits, as it were, of that day which He had blessed and sancti-

fied, and which the patriarchs doubtlessly gave Him; but this is vastly different from a direct command to keep holy the Jewish typical Sabbath day. The former we admit from inference; the latter we deny.

Institution of the Jewish Sabbath.

That the Jewish Sabbath was given to the Jewish nation, or rather nation of Israel, and not to the world, is plainly evident to any one who will carefully read the history of its institution as recorded in the sixteenth chapter of Exodus. On the evening of the fifteenth day of the second month of the Jewish sacred year, the Israelites arrived in the wilderness of Sin, weary with the day's march through the desert, and having exhausted the unleavened bread which they carried out of Egypt, and which had now lasted them thirty days, counting from the morning of the day in which the Passover lamb was killed, and fearing that they would all perish there in the desert, they murmured against Moses and Aaron. Then we are told that the Lord said unto Moses, "Behold, I will rain bread from heaven for you; and the people shall go out and gather a certain rate every day, that I may prove them, whether they will walk in My law, or no. And it shall come to pass, that on the sixth day they shall prepare that which they bring in; and it shall be twice as much as they gather daily." Then according to this promise quails were given them in the evening and manna in the morning, until the sixth day. "And it came to pass, that on the sixth day they gathered twice as much bread, two omers

for one man; and all the rulers of the congregation came and told Moses. And he said unto them, This is that which the Lord hath said, To-morrow is the rest of the holy sabbath unto the Lord; bake that which ye will bake to-day, and seethe that ye will seethe; and that which remaineth over lay up for you to be kept until the morning." Our English version here would rather indicate, that what Moses tells them that the Lord said, had been said some time before; but such is not the case. The true rendering is, "This is *what* the Lord *said*," now revealed to the people for the first time. Then when the seventh day had arrived, "Moses said, Eat that to-day; for to-day is A sabbath [not THE sabbath] unto the Lord; to-day ye shall not find it in the field. Six days ye shall gather it; but on the seventh day, which is the Sabbath, in it there shall be none."[1]

Here we have the institution of the Jewish Sabbath, which in its institution is denominated "*a sabbath*," and henceforth called "the sabbath."[2] Then we read, that in direct violation of this commandment *some* of the people went out on the seventh day to gather manna, and found none. Then the Lord said unto Moses, "How long refuse ye to keep My commandments and My laws?" (Other versions say, "Till when do you not wish to keep My commandment and My laws?") "See, for that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore He giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days; abide ye every man in his place, let no man go out of his place on the seventh day. So the people rested on the seventh day."

Here, then, we have a record of the institution of the Jewish Sabbath, instituted among and for the Jews; a commandment given to the Jewish nation, and not to the world. Those who maintain that the Christian Lord's day is the Jewish Sabbath transferred into the Christian system, contend that it was given to the whole world from the beginning, and that this is but an historical record enforcing its observance. The writer of the prize essay, "The Holy Sabbath," quotes the first half of the twenty-third verse of this chapter: "To-morrow is the Sabbath of the Lord;" and then adds; "This is not the language of a legislator, but of an historian, and the whole context shows that it was not a new, but simply the revival of an old statute that had fallen into disuse." (*The Holy Sabbath*, page 29.) The writer is undoubtedly in error here. The whole context clearly indicates that it was the giving of a new law, and not the revival of an old one. The command: "Eat to-day; for to-day is a Sabbath unto the Lord;" like the whole of the context, contains not only a law regulating the gathering of the manna, *but also an authoritative appointment of a day of rest.* Moses tells the people: "The Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore He giveth you the bread of two days;" which proves clearly that the Jewish Sabbath was a new institution given with the bread, and that the manna, or its equivalent, and the day of rest are so intimately united that they cannot be divorced. "So the people rested on the seventh day;" that is, because the bread of two days had been given them. This is the first record of any people resting on the

seventh day, and we are not left in doubt as to the reason why they did this, and why God commanded them to do so. The Sabbath day was given to the Jews because God gave them food from heaven for six days, doubling the supply on the sixth. The confirmations of this day with other and more important reasons for observing it, will be examined in their proper place. If the observance of the Jewish Sabbath is an old statute, we should be pleased to see more potent proof of it than can be derived from the sixteenth chapter of Exodus. Until such proof is forthcoming, we shall believe as we now do, that it was first given and only given to the Jews, and not to the world.

The Prophetic Significance of the Jewish Sabbath in the Desert.

The author of the prize essay, after referring to the manner in which the Sabbath is interlaced in all the symbolisms of Scripture, says: "This recurrence is just as noticeable in the *typical development of Scripture*. That development is in septenary cycles. Seven is the archetypal number, and seven periods the archetypal cycle, in typical cosmogony. Thus the seven seals contain the seven trumpets, and the seventh trumpet contains the seven vials. Seven days bring on the Sabbath, seven weeks the Pentecost, seven months the atonement, seven years the sabbatic year, seven sabbatic years the jubilee, seven thousand years the millenary period, as is generally believed, and for aught we know the seventh millenary period will be the dawn of heaven, the final ever-

lasting jubilee." (*The Holy Sabbath*, page 10.) Excepting perhaps the latter part of this quotation, that referring to the millennium, it contains a very important truth. Let us see how well it applies to the institution of the Jewish Sabbath in the desert.

The Jewish nation may be considered to be a type of the whole world from the death of Christ to the end of time. The exodus from Egypt may, then, well represent God's calling a people to Himself through Christ, either by the preaching of the word to adults, or, as in the case of infants, by being born under gospel influences. The cold, hard, unleavened bread which they brought with them from Egypt is that innocence of childhood (the innocence of ignorance) which Paul knew before the commandment came. (Rom. vii. 9–11.) This can but barely sustain life, and that but for a short time. It gradually grows harder and more mouldy until it finally disappears altogether, and we are brought face to face with Moses and Aaron, the representatives of the Law and the Sacrifice, where we are found murmuring at our sad condition. The promise is then given us, and immediately fulfilled, of bread from heaven. Christ Himself is the true bread from heaven, but He was not given to the Israelites in the form of the Holy Comforter at the same time that the law was given. The sacrifices were first instituted, and then the prophecies given; a temporary bread, which could afford life only for the time being, but which would disappear before the coming of the true bread. A double supply of these, however, was given in the teachings of John the Baptist and the disciples of Christ, and

of Christ Himself in the flesh, before the rest of the Holy Comforter was instituted. And so it is with us through the journey of life. As the hard, unleavened bread of the world passes away, we find ever increasing consolation in God's word, till we are about to leave the world, and then comes a double supply, and we enter into rest. These six days are prophetic days, and if multiplied by seven, give us forty-two. Counting from the tenth day of the first month, when the Passover lamb was chosen (Ex. xii. 3), to the twenty-second day of the second month, that on which the Jewish Sabbath was first instituted, including both the first and last of these two days, according to the Jewish mode of reckoning, we have just forty-two days; or omitting these two days, we have forty. In like manner, after journeying forty years in the desert, stopping at just forty-two stations, the whole nation arrives at the land of Canaan, and *rests* from the toils and weary wanderings in the desert. Here the manna, which had furnished them with food through these long years, suddenly ceases, and they partake of the fresh fruits of the land.

But the Jewish Sabbath is not discontinued when the Jews enter Canaan. A law had already been given which confirms its continuance till the true manna and the true rest should come. On the contrary, in connection with this, another Sabbath was now to be established, a yearly Sabbath, which was not given to the world, nor to Israel in the desert, but was confined alone to Canaan. "And the Lord spake unto Moses in Mount Sinai, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them,

When ye come into the land which I give you, then shall the land keep a sabbath unto the Lord. Six years thou shalt sow thy field, and six years thou shalt prune thy vineyard and gather in the fruit thereof: but in the seventh year shall be a sabbath of rest unto the land, a sabbath for the Lord: thou shalt neither sow thy field nor prune thy vineyard." And in connection with this was also established the Jubilee, which, like the former, belonged alone to the land of Canaan, and not to the world. (Lev. xxv.) These Canaanitish Sabbaths were an outgrowth of the condition of the Jews in their own land, and ceased to exist when Canaan ceased to be a type of God's kingdom, just as the Jewish Sabbath ceased to exist when the family of Jacob ceased to be the typical kingdom of God, in the coming of the Saviour, not of Israel, but of the world.

Now, just as the Jewish Sabbath was instituted forty-two days after the Passover lamb was chosen, and the nation entered into the rest of Canaan after forty-two journeys in the desert, so the Son of man came after forty-two generations had passed away from Abraham, according to Matthew's genealogy, and forty from David, according to Luke. That true bread from heaven of which the manna was an imperfect type, if type at all, gives, not life to the body, but life to the soul, sent not to the typical Jew, but to the Christian world; not to give a rest after the labor of gathering it, but to give a rest from sin. The Shadow has passed away now; the Body, Christ, has come.

Some critics have supposed that Luke, writing for

the Gentile church, speaking of the ascension of our Lord as occurring forty days after His resurrection (Acts i. 3), did not use the Jewish mode of reckoning, which would give forty-two days, counting the day He arose and the day He ascended. If this is true, the forty-second day would fall upon a Jewish Sabbath, a most appropriate day for the completion of our Lord's entire work upon earth. That our Lord ascended from earth to heaven on the Jewish Sabbath, and not on Thursday (according to the old almanacs), can hardly be doubted; otherwise Luke would not have been so careful to tell us that the place where He ascended was a Sabbath-day's journey from Jerusalem. (See *Alford on Acts*, i. 12.)

The words of the prophet Hosea, "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called My son out of Egypt," being a prophecy of future events, are not as applicable to ancient Israel as to the present Israel of God, or those who are called by His word as it is revealed to us in the Old and New Testaments. Those who are born of religious parents are called out of Egypt in infancy, when the manna, the "milk of the word," is fed to them by their parents in childhood. The manna does not appear to be so much a type of Christ in the Holy Comforter, promised before and sent down after His ascension, that "strong meat" which Paul speaks of (Heb. v. 12), but a type of the word as taught before regeneration; something coming from heaven, yet through a human instrumentality, and not directly from the Father, as were the teachings of the Holy Spirit; something that if abused

might become corrupted (Ex. xvi. 20), yet of which a double supply was to be secured in preparation for that rest when the Holy Spirit by regeneration becomes our teacher.

"Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Moses gave you not that bread from heaven. For the bread of God is He which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world. Then said they [the Jews] unto Him, Lord, evermore give us this bread. And Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life: he that cometh to Me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on Me shall never thirst." (John vi. 32–35.)

Now we well know that what Moses gave was the *law*, and that which frees us from the law is the gospel. The law condemns to death; the gospel gives life. We now see the full meaning of Christ's words: "I am that bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die." (John vi. 48–50.) The Jewish Sabbath, then, is typical of that rest under the gospel which frees us from the fear of death.

It is usually supposed that the manna was a type of Christ. This can hardly be true. If it were, it would not become filled with worms, nor would the gathering of it be prohibited on the Sabbath day. Again, the manna ceased when the Israelites entered Canaan. Does Christ's presence leave us when we enter into the rest of His kingdom? Paul refers to a spiritual food of which the Israelites par-

took on the night in which they passed through the Red sea (1 Cor. x. 3, 4), but then Paul tells us that that spiritual food was Christ himself, and not the material manna which fell in the desert. It would rather appear, then, that as Moses gave the law, and the manna was not given by Moses, but rained from heaven, it was a type of something that would give life for the time being, but would disappear when the true bread came which giveth life to the world. Now, if the gospel is the true bread *rained from heaven* (Deut. xxxii. 2), then the spiritual manna which precedes the gospel must be the ceremonial law and the prophecies, occupying an intermediate position between the moral law and the gospel, and yet being in reality but an introduction to the gospel. The ceremonial law is fulfilled, and the prophecies cease to be given, after the true bread of Canaan, the gospel, comes. Yet on the last day, that period when our Saviour walked the earth clothed in human flesh, there was a double supply given in the parables which He spake and the miracles which He performed.

Confirmation of the Jewish Sabbath in the Giving of the Law.

"Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made

heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." Here we have the Jewish Sabbath confirmed to the Jewish people, and a second reason given why they should observe it. That reason is, that in six days God rested from His work, and rested on the seventh and blessed it. The cause, as stated here, is the glory and magnificence of the day of rest after the labor of creation, prophetic of Christ's rest after the labor of redeeming a world, and of our rest, through Him, after having toiled through the Old Covenant and resting in the New.

No one can doubt for a moment that this commandment was given to the Jews. But it is maintained that it was not given to them alone. They tell us, "It was set at the beginning, and was clearly intended for Adam and his posterity. Hence the 'stranger within the gates,' the representative of the whole outside world, was also required to keep the law." (*The Holy Sabbath*, page 27.) It is rather difficult to understand how the stranger within the gate can be a representative of the outside world before the gate is opened to the Gentiles. When Christ comes, who Himself is the *gate*, and by the sacrifice of the cross opens the door to the Gentile world, then the Gentiles will be admitted into His kingdom. We find no proof here that God gave the Jewish Sabbath to the world.

Now, if we turn to the fifth chapter of Deuteronomy, we will learn the reason why this day was given especially to the Israelites. We have already

learned when it was given, and why it was to be observed as a holy day, and here we have God's own word as to why it was given to typical Israel. After repeating the Fourth Commandment, He adds: "And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm; THEREFORE *the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day.*" As God rested after the work of creation, so He commanded the children of Israel to observe a day of rest from the toil and affliction of Egypt. Exodus xx. 11 tells us why the day was blessed and hallowed, and Deut. v. 15 tells us why it was given to the Israelites.

But an argument in favor of the transfer of the Jewish Sabbath is deduced from the fact that "*it was formally incorporated in the moral law.*" We quote again: "The ten commandments were spoken in an audible voice, by the Lord Himself, from the summit of Mount Sinai, in the audience of the people. They were then written with His own fingers upon enduring tables of stone. They were then, by His express command, deposited in the ark of the covenant, directly under the overshadowing mercy-seat, the symbolic throne of the Most High, indicative of the fact that they constituted the foundation of that throne; 'and heaven and earth shall pass away before one jot or tittle of that law shall in any wise fail.'" (*The Holy Sabbath*, page 32.) Can it be possible? We read this sentence again and again, but there can be no doubt about its meaning. It certainly means just what the words express. We

find it upon the page of a prize essay, for which the sum of two hundred dollars was awarded by a committee appointed for the purpose, and it was chosen from one hundred and eight manuscripts, at least so the prefatory notice informs us. It is written by a prominent minister of the Presbyterian Church, and published by the Presbyterian Committee of Publication. There can be no doubt about it, and yet how much error it contains. The quotation "and heaven and earth shall pass away before one jot or tittle of that law shall in any wise fail," is nowhere to be found in the New Testament. Christ says, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." (Matt. xxiv. 35; Mark xiii. 31; Luke xxi. 33.) But then He means by "my words," His own gospel, in contradistinction to the passing away of the whole Jewish economy, which He has just described under the symbolic language of sun, moon, and stars, and which did pass away when the veil of the temple was rent at the hour of His death on the cross. Again He says: "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, *till all be fulfilled*." (Matt. v. 18.) This is simply a declaration that the law is binding until fulfilled, and no longer. When fulfilled, it ceases to exist. The passage from which these words were probably intended to be a quotation are to be found in Luke xvi. 16–18. The whole passage reads: "The law and the prophets were until John; since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it. *And it is easier for heaven and earth to pass than one tittle of the law to fail.*

Whosoever putteth away his wife and marrieth another committeth adultery; and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband committeth adultery." The declaration here is, that it is *easier* for heaven and earth to pass, not that they *shall pass away before* the law is fulfilled. The very point of the law which Christ is here talking about, *adultery*, is one that must be fulfilled, and consequently pass away, before the heavens and the earth. When the author of *The Holy Sabbath* penned these words, he never dreamed that he was misquoting the Scriptures in order to prove an error. It is the natural result of an entire misconception of the relations sustained by the Old and New Covenants. The author's heart is right, but he has failed to obtain a distinct perception of the line of demarcation between the Old and New Covenants, and stumbling over the word *mercy-seat* in our version, which is a mis-translation of the *propitiatory* of the ark or symbolical covering of sin (Psalms xxxii. 1) in the bosom of Christ Jesus, he at once supposed that it was a symbol of God's throne. Are the Ten Commandments the foundation of God's eternal throne? Throughout the whole Mosaic ritual, the whole symbolism of the Mosaic law is accompanied by blood; blood poured out, blood sprinkled, blood mingled with running water, blood everywhere, indicative that the moral law invariably condemns to death. The universal language of Scripture, whether in symbol, prophecy, or epistle, is that there is no life in the moral law. "Salvation is of the Jews" only, as the ceremonial law and prophecy adumbrate the gospel. We may well inquire, then,

whether a law whose empire is universal death can be the throne of Him in whose presence death shall never come. Why, even here upon earth, we are told that "the sting of death is the law," but death is disarmed of its sting by the gospel. "The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." We read in the new covenant of a "*throne of grace*," but not of a throne based on the moral law. Will any one tell us that the command, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife," is one of the pillars of the eternal throne in a kingdom where they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels? We read of the *everlasting gospel*, but nowhere do we read of the *everlasting law*. The members of the new covenant Church are spoken of as "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone," but they are nowhere represented as being built upon Moses. Moses' disciples belong to the covenant of works, not that of grace. Not the name of Moses, but "the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb," appear upon the foundation stones of the wall of jasper.

Are we still to be under the Mosiac law written upon tablets of stone when we arrive at home in heaven? Is that throne, which shall shelter us then, to be based on the Ten Commandments? Does not our state of probation end when we pass from earth to heaven? Of what use are the Ten Commandments in a world where there can be no sin? Do the Scriptures teach that God's throne is based on

the Ten Commandments, or is it but a *baseless* tradition?

We do not deny but that there is a moral law given to the universe, written, "not in tablets of stone," but in "fleshly tablets of the heart," which is eternal; but the Jewish Sabbath forms no part of it, any more than a piece of canvass on which is painted a portrait of Martin Luther forms a part of Luther's body and soul. The Ten Commandments, spoken in an audible voice from the summit of a typical mountain, in the ears of a typical people, and engraven upon tablets of material stone, and then laid away in a typical ark—which, with all its contents and appurtenances, except the Shekinah, was afterwards doubtless destroyed (tradition to the contrary) by the enemies of Israel and of Israel's God—are vastly different from the moral law given by God to the universe. A Jewish Sabbath given to a typical nation in remembrance of a rest from carnal bondage, and a type of a rest from sin, is immeasurably different from its own antitype. In Christ we enjoy the antitype, and will for ever. To keep one day in seven holy, in memory of a rest from sin through the resurrection of Christ from the dead, is part of the moral law; but even this must pass away when we enter that holy Jerusalem where there is no priesthood, no altar, no temple, and no gospel ministry, and where all eternity (not time) is equally holy. To observe one day in seven, in memory of a nation's escape from carnal slavery, let that nation be Jew or pagan, is not an everlasting law.

The ark of the covenant was a type of Christ's hu-

man nature. In His bosom was hid the law. He alone of the woman's seed has kept the law in all its purity. Christ was "made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law;" and when redeemed, they are dead to the law even here in this life. To be redeemed from under the law is to be redeemed from the penalty of the law, and that penalty is death; and shall those who are heirs of eternal life be for ever beneath the shade of a throne whose very foundation stones speak of nothing but universal death? Impossible! The Shekinah dwelling between the cherubim was a type of the Holy Spirit dwelling in Christ, and which descended in visible form upon Him at His birth, in the form of the star which the wise men followed from the East, and in the form of a dove on the day of His baptism at the hands of John the Baptist. Christ kept the law for man through life, and annihilated it for him through eternity.

If the Jewish Sabbath is Transferred to the Christian System, we are Morally Bound to Keep it as the Jews were Required to do.

If our Lord's day is but a transfer of the Jewish Sabbath, then we should observe it with the same care and attention that the Jews were required to do by the Mosaic law. In the history of creation we read: "The evening and the morning were the first day." We well know that the Jewish Sabbath commenced at sunset Friday evening, and ended at sunset Saturday evening. Now if this were a part of the moral law, and in memory of the "evening and

morning" of the seventh day of creation, we should be strict in its observance, and not commence the day at twelve o'clock Saturday night, and end at twelve o'clock Sunday night, as we now do.

Again, we should observe Saturday and not Sunday, as we now do. To this it is answered that the apostles changed the day. They did! Where is the *proof* of it? The *apostles* changed the day? And who were the apostles? If the apostles changed the day, then they are superior to Moses. If the apostles changed the day, then they had a right to demolish the day and substitute another day. Changing seven to eight by the apostles is a failing of a pretty big "jot" long *before* the heavens and the earth have passed away. If the apostles made this change, then there must have been something in the law that has been fulfilled. But did the apostles change the day? Let us examine the proof they give us. They present passages of Scripture which speak of the apostles as meeting on the first day of the week; breaking bread, etc., on the first day of the week. We may accept these passages merely for the inference that may be derived from them in favor of the observance of the Lord's day instead of the Jewish Sabbath; but in the absence of something more positive they prove nothing. We say they prove nothing, from the very fact that inferences may be derived from other passages of Scripture, equally as valid, that the apostles observed the Jewish Sabbath. Just as Christ had been in the habit of "standing up to read" in the Jewish synagogue on the Sabbath day, so the apostles went into the synagogues and preached on the Sabbath day.

Paul "reasoned in the synagogue every Sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks." (Acts xviii. 4.) His historian says of him, that at Philippi, "on the Sabbath he went out of the city by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made; and we sat down, and spake unto the women which resorted thither." (Acts xvi. 13.) At Antioch, he and his companions "went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day," and preached to the people, and at the close of his discourse the people invited them to come the next Sabbath. Then we are told: "And the next Sabbath day came almost the whole city together to hear the word of God." (Acts xiii. 14-44.) At Thessalonia, "Paul, as his manner was, went in unto them, and three Sabbath days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures." (Acts xvii. 2.) Now, if in any of these meetings they had continued their preaching until sundown, and had then partaken of bread, as it would be natural they should do after the toils of the day; or celebrated their communion or breaking of bread, as Christ did with His disciples after partaking of the passover, and as the apostles probably often did, it would have been recorded by the sacred historian as having been done on the first day of the week, as sundown Saturday evening closed the Jewish Sabbath. Now, the proof in favor of the Jewish Sabbath being transferred to the New Covenant, and then changed by the apostles to the first day of the week, is so extremely slender that we feel that we are guilty of no heresy if we abandon that view altogether.

The Lord's day we believe to be established by a

higher authority than either the apostles or Moses, even by Him who is Lord of the Sabbath day.

If the Jewish Sabbath has been transferred to Christianity, we are morally bound to observe it as the Jews did, and the man who does not do so should be put to death. The writer says: "the only part that strictly belonged to the state was the death penalty, which was afterwards added, and which has been repealed, being no part of the original law." (*The Holy Sabbath*, page 30.) By whom was it repealed? Did the apostles do it? If so, when? Where is the record? The *death penalty* for murder is no part of the original law written upon the tablets of stone. Was that repealed at the same time? By whom?

Again, no beast was permitted to perform any labor on the Jewish Sabbath. No man-servant nor maid-servant, and no Gentile who was temporarily stopping at the house of a Jew, for so the phrase "stranger that is within thy gates" is to be understood, were permitted to do any work whatever. "In it thou shalt not do any work." No fire was allowed to be kindled, no food was allowed to be purchased or even prepared on that day. The command was very strict. "On the seventh day there shall be to you an holy day, a Sabbath of rest to the Lord; whosoever doth work therein shall be put to death." (Ex. xxxv. 2.) Even a man found gathering sticks on that day was commanded to be stoned. "And" they "stoned him with stones, and he died; as the Lord commanded Moses." (Num. xv. 32–36.) Nor was this all. We read in the New Testament, as the kingdom of God (not the Jewish nation) was

verging on toward the New Covenant, of a Sabbath day's journey, but the ancient law says, "Let no man go out of his place on the seventh day." Now, will you tell us that that was a law given to the world, and not to a nation? Will you tell us that the Esquimaux in his snow hut must not kindle a fire on the seventh day to prepare his food; but that he must take it frozen as hard as a rock, or perish with hunger? No. The very demands of the New Covenant that we should not forget the assembling of ourselves together, prove that not only the death penalty, but the Jewish law itself, in the ceremonial and national part of it, is fulfilled by the establishment of the New Covenant.

But you plead works of necessity. Necessity? We would rather hear you plead a God of reason and of justice, whose laws can be obeyed without inconvenience by all classes and conditions of men, than to see you resort to such miserable subterfuges as this. If the Jewish law is binding now, why do you not obey it? If the Jewish Sabbath, as given and observed in the desert, is binding on Christians to-day, then our evangelical churches are a band of Sabbath breakers. You ride to church on your horses and in your carriages, and you return to a warm dinner, prepared by the "stranger within your gate" (if your cook happens to be a foreigner), and you complacently tell us that the only thing about this law that is repealed is the death penalty. Will you tell us that you feel yourself free to break God's holy law with impunity, merely because the Jewish nation does not possess the power to enforce the

death penalty? Or, do these infringements on the law, written on *tablets of stone*, come under the category of works of mercy and necessity? Look the stubborn fact squarely in the face, and then tell us whether these are works of mercy and necessity any more than the gathering of manna by the Israelites in the desert, or the gathering of sticks to cook it with? Works of mercy and necessity, indeed! If it is your law, obey it. Will you charge us with heresy because we deny that the Jewish Sabbath is binding on Christians? Then you will permit us to charge you with being a band of Sabbath breakers, and according *to your own law* you should be stoned till you are dead.

The Sabbath Made for Man, and not Man for the Sabbath.

"We have the emphatic declaration of the Master Himself that 'the Sabbath was made for man,' not for the Jew only, or for the Hottentot or Arabian, or any other one nation or people, but for man universally." (*The Holy Sabbath*, page 28.) Will any candid unprejudiced mind read the second chapter of Mark, and the fifth chapter of Luke from the thirty-sixth verse to the twelfth verse of the sixth chapter, and then tell us that the idea Christ wished to convey to the minds of His hearers when He pronounced the above words was, that the Jewish Sabbath was made for *all men*, and not alone for the Jew, when He Himself, before their very eyes, broke the Jewish Sabbath, and was here defending His disciples for having done so? The passage, in

connection with its context, proves just the reverse of what is intended in the above quotation. Christ had again and again broken the Jewish ceremonial law; when He sat at the table with lepers, put His hands on a corpse, allowed ceremonially impure women to fondle and caress His feet, and His disciples to prepare food on the Sabbath day. The scribes and Pharisees could not believe Him to be the Messiah unless He observed the law of Moses. But He gives them to understand that the kingdom of God was coming—a new creation, and not a patch sewed upon an old garment; that the Jewish law, like an old leather bottle, was now worthless when the old wine was exhausted; but new bottles must be prepared for the wine of the New Covenant; and then He tells them that "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath; therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." Can anything be plainer than this? The Sabbath being made for man, and He being the Lord of the Sabbath, as well as of the whole Mosaic law, has a right to dispose of the Sabbath as He thinks best. If He chooses to set the Jewish Sabbath aside by the establishment of the kingdom of heaven, He has a perfect right to do so. The very fact that He breaks the Jewish ceremonial law is proof that He is Lord of that law; and establishes His Messiahship, although the short-sighted Pharisees could not see it. It is a sad misquotation of Scripture that would force this passage to do service in defence of the universality of the Jewish Sabbath. "The Sabbath was made for man," and when man's representative shall come in the power and

glory of His kingdom, then He will give that true rest, of which the Jewish Sabbath is but an imperfect shadow.

The New Covenant is not a Patch on an Old Garment.

"Let it first be asserted that if the day was intended for the Jews," says the author of *The Holy Sabbath*, page 25, "then for that very reason it must still exist, for they are still the people of the Lord, cast off for a time, it is true, but not for ever; for they are yet to be brought back into the fold of their covenant-keeping God. (Rom. xi. 25.) The covenant with Israel is an everlasting covenant. If the Sabbath is the sign of that covenant, it, too, must be a perpetual sign. Besides, 'he is not a Jew who is one outwardly.' If the covenant be transferred to believers, and now confirmed unto them as the spiritual children of Israel, it must still remain the same everlasting covenant, and as such must retain the same perpetual sign." That we may know how well the above corresponds with the language of Scripture, let us turn to Jeremiah xxxi. 31, and read, "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which My covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord; but this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel: After those days, saith the

Lord, I will put My law in their inward parts, and will be their God, and they shall be My people." This prophecy is now being continually fulfilled in the regeneration of the Christian Gentiles, and has no reference to the people called Jews, of the present day. Paul, after quoting these words, adds: "In that He saith, a new covenant, He hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away." (Heb. viii.) And yet the writer tells us that "the covenant made with Israel is an everlasting covenant." If he had told us that the new covenant made with the regenerated Israel of God, and which is now being gathered into the spiritual Canaan from among all nations, is an "everlasting covenant, even the sure mercies of David" (Isa. lv. 3), he would then have told us what is perfectly true. Prophecies to the same effect may be found throughout the fifty-fourth and fifty-fifth chapters of Isaiah, in Ezek. xxxvi. 25–38, and many other portions of the Old Testament, referring to the New Covenant, not established with the old typical Israel, but with the antitype, the true Israel of God; not born of the flesh, but born of God's Holy Spirit —proving that "the everlasting covenant" in Christ's blood is the covenant made with God's true Israel redeemed from sin, and not the covenant made with the typical Israel relieved from Egyptian bondage.

The author of *The Holy Sabbath*, like many other well meaning but misinformed theologians, is lost in the fog of old Judaism. He thinks that because there is a people in the world claiming to be the carnal seed of Abraham, and that although Christ told them

that they were of their own father the devil, yet in some way "they are still the people of the Lord," and then he misquotes Rom. xi. 25 in support of his erroneous views. He might as well have quoted the next verse, "And so all Israel shall be saved," to prove that no Jew could be lost, as to quote this to prove that the Jews are still the people of the Lord. In Paul's time the temple was still standing, with all the sacrifices and ordinances connected with it. The gospel, according to our Lord's command, was first to be preached to the Jews, and every possible effort was made by the apostles to win them to Christ. The "remnant" which was to be saved, spoken of by the prophets, did embrace Christianity; some of them, as did the Ebionite Jews, continuing to observe the ceremonies of the Old Covenant in connection with faith in Christ. But when the temple was destroyed and the sacrifice taken away, old Israel ceased to be the typical people of God. Rejecting the prophet like unto Moses, (Deut. xviii. 15; Acts iii. 22,) as presented to them in the gospel by the preaching of the apostles, they were spiritually destroyed, and as God's people were completely annihilated, (Acts iii. 22, 23,) and henceforward were no more heirs of God's kingdom, any more than any other Gentile nation. Virtually they became Gentiles, and in the eyes of God occupy the same position to-day that the Laplanders and Japanese do. They are not heirs of the New Covenant, for they have never entered into it; and they are not heirs of the Old, for they have broken it. There is not a promise in the Bible that is not an heritage of the converted Gentile

as much as of the converted Jew, and without conversion to Christ there are no promises to either. To the Jew out of Christ there are no other promises than those to all other members of Satan's kingdom, that they "shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of His power." The assumption that the Jews are to return to the literal Jerusalem, and that the Old Covenant is to be established with them, is a most dangerous error, and contrary to all the teachings of God's word. The only door to Canaan today is Christ, and the Jew who enters Christ is as much in Canaan in the pork-killing city of Cincinnati as he would be in Jerusalem; and should he go to Jerusalem with the superstitious idea that by doing so he would enter the kingdom of Israel, it would be a most positive proof that he was going to Satan in search of the kingdom of God. All prophecies concerning the restoration of the kingdom of Israel, and the gathering of the dispersed among all nations, must have their fulfilment in the antitype, and not in the type.

Paul, in the third chapter of Galatians, compares the Jewish nation to a school, and the law to a schoolmaster. Now, a school-master may write on his blackboard laws for the use of his pupils while they are in his school, but when they pass out of his school they are no longer under *his laws*, and yet the system of morality which the schoolmaster's laws were designed to teach them, is of infinitely more importance. This is the reality, of which the school-master's laws are only the shadow. The school-master prepares his pu-

pils for a higher destiny than that of occupying his benches and submitting to his laws; laws which are only intended to prepare them for a higher code of morals than any ever written upon his blackboard, or engraved upon Moses' tables of stone.

The Jewish Sabbath, then, is a shadow fulfilled when the body comes, and that body is Christ. When He comes, the shadow, like the school-master's blackboard laws, is of no further use, and passes away. And the apostle says that "the righteousness of the law is fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." "For we are the circumcision, which worship God in the Spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh." Those, then, who have Christ's Spirit, are not bound by the law of the school-master. Christ says: "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath," and in the same way we say: The school was made for the pupil, and not the pupil for the school. The school-master's law is intended for the preparation of his pupil for a higher destiny than that of occupying a seat in his school; and when he has entered upon that destiny, the morality taught by his law, and not the law itself, is binding upon his soul. Hence we say that the Lord's day is a rest of the soul, and not a rest of the body alone. It is a Sabbath of the soul. The Jewish Sabbath was a rest of the body in memory of a rest from Egyptian bondage, the liberator being Moses, who led the people out into the desert, but was unable to provide them with food to keep them from perishing with hunger. The Christian Lord's day is a rest of the

soul from sin, our leader being Christ Jesus, who Himself gives that true bread from heaven which giveth life unto the world. At the earnest request of Moses, God gave the Israelites manna, and with it the Jewish Sabbath; but the true bread and the true rest are given, not to typical Israel, but to the world; and whosoever eateth this bread shall enter into rest; that is, have everlasting life.

Again, we ask, can a Jewish carnal ordinance, typical of a spiritual blessing, be transferred from a carnal typical kingdom over into a spiritual kingdom? Are not the words of our Lord Jesus Christ most decisive upon this point? "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." What a host of disciples Nicodemus has, who cannot distinguish between a Jewish Sabbath and the rest of God's spiritual kingdom! Can the carnal be transferred to the spiritual, when the Scriptures emphatically declare that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kindom of God"? But supposing the Jewish Sabbath to be transferred, why not transfer a thousand other things? The only evidence we have that the temple service was done away with, is that the shadow is fulfilled in the body—Christ. If not, why not transfer the sacrifices of sheep and oxen? Why not transfer circumcision? Some will tell us that we do in baptism, which we most emphatically deny; the whole argument in favor of it being based upon an erroneous foundation. Why not transfer the golden altar, with the burning of incense, just as the Roman Catholic Church has done? There is certainly as much au-

thority for it as there is for transferring the Jewish Sabbath.

About the only thing that may be said to be transferred from the Old Testament system to the New is the Jewish synagogue, which now appears under the form of the Christian Church; but even this had no foundation in Moses. It undoubtedly owes its origin to the prophets, and was probably in some way connected with the schools of the prophets, and being an outgrowth of the prophetic system, which was nothing more or less than an outline of the gospel ministry, it has come down to us with very little modification. We do not deny that there was a shade of the gospel extending back into the Old Covenant. There was, and so there is, a shade of the Old Covenant extending down into the New, but it is only a shade. The reality of both ceases at the dividing line. The moral law runs through both, just as the life blood of the New Testament, flowing from Christ's heart, runs through the whole ceremonial law; but is as different from the law written upon tables of stone as the true bread from heaven, which giveth life to the world, is different from the manna which fell in the desert, giving but temporary relief, and disappearing when the bread of Canaan supplies its place.

Now, we take the ground that the Jewish Sabbath, like any other strictly Mosaic law, was fulfilled in Christ. Christ says: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in

no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled." If the Jewish Sabbath was a type of Christ, then it most certainly must have been fulfilled in Him.

But we are told that "the Fourth Commandment is enjoined on Israel as one of 'the ten words'; and if you strike out this one, why not strike out any other, or in fact all the rest?"

We answer, that we do not propose to strike out the Fourth Commandment from the decalogue. We consider the Fourth Commandment fully as binding as any one of the ten. Those who hold the views which we are endeavoring to sustain do not base the divine authority for the observance of the Lord's day upon the Fourth Commandment, but upon the practice of the apostles. We must here beg leave to differ from them, for we consider the practice of the apostles alone as too vague and uncertain; whereas, we find a divine command for the observance of the Lord's day in the Fourth Commandment. Professor Schaff says: "The former was only a type and prophecy of the latter. For as this *new* creation, the resurrection of Christ and the founding of His Church, is greater than the first creation of the heavens and the earth, and brings it to its perfection, so does the Christian *Sunday* transcend the Jewish Sabbath. This direct derivation of the Church festival of Sunday from the living centre of the gospel of Jesus Christ, is certainly the primitive view of it, and the one which best answers to Paul's system of doctrine; whereas, the exclusively legal view which bases the institution primarily and directly on the Fourth Commandment, in the first place affords no sufficient ex-

planation of the transfer of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week; and secondly, is utterly irreconcilable with clear declarations of the New Testament." (*History of Apostolic Church*, page 554.)

Professor Schaff we believe to be right in basing the divine authority for the Lord's day "*primarily or directly*" upon "*the living centre of the gospel of Jesus Christ;*" yet we consider the Fourth Commandment, when eliminated from its typical and prophetical character, of equally binding authority. What is stricken out by the coming of Christ is this *typical* and *prophetic character*, leaving the *moral* part of it as binding as any other of the ten.

But a careful examination of the decalogue will give us a better understanding of this matter. The preface to the Ten Commandments is included with the Commandments, and was written upon the tables of stone; and yet, applying it individually, it is *literally* true of but one generation of Hebrews; and collectively, of but one nation of all the tribes and races of men that have ever lived, or ever will live, on our globe; and if applied either individually or collectively to the Christian Church to-day, would be absolutely false. But in its metaphysical and moral sense—or, in other words, in the fulfilment of its typical and prophetic character—it is as true to-day of every man, woman and child brought under gospel influences, as it was literally of each individual Hebrew the day that God pronounced those words from the top of Sinai. Every professing Christian teaches it to his child, and the beginning

of all missionary labor is to teach it to the pagan; yet no one ever dreams that this preface is to be understood to-day in its literal sense. The passage of the Red Sea by the Israelites is not a type of regeneration, but a type of any influence that brings any son or daughter of Adam under the reign of the law. Were it a type of regeneration, it would annihilate that great fundamental doctrine so firmly taught in the New Testatent, the perseverance of the saints; for a large proportion of the Israelites that came out of Egypt perished in the desert, *on account of their unbelief*, (Heb. iii. 16-19); and God will allow no truly regenerated soul to perish. But the teaching of God's word brings the soul out of pagan darkness, and sends it on its way towards regeneration, which is accomplished in the reception of Christ, and not Moses, as a complete and sufficient Saviour.

Now, if we eliminate the typical from the Fourth Commandment, as we do from the preface, we shall have a commandment as binding as any in the decalogue, to sanctify and keep holy the Lord's day, and not the Jewish type. How far the change may affect the *mode* of observing the day may be more difficult to determine. The death penalty is certainly abolished. Preparing a warm dinner, riding to church in a carriage or on a horse, when these do not infringe upon the duties or conscience of others, are considered permissible by the majority of professing Christians. Perhaps, if we consider that the day is one to be fully dedicated to God's service, we will not go far astray if we observe the day according to the rules we observe in exacting duties from those

in our employ during the days of the week, and the obligations we feel bound to comply with in rendering service to those who employ us. This subject will, however, be more fully examined when we come to discuss the duties and obligations of the Lord's day.

An Incontrovertible Argument.

When the Jewish Sabbath was instituted, the Lord commanded the Israelites not to travel or do any work on the seventh day. The command is very explicit: "Abide ye every man in his place, let no man go out of his place on the seventh day." (Ex. xvi. 29.) And then we are told, "So the people rested on the seventh day." Now, the day they went out of Egypt, the fifteenth day of the month Nisan, would have been a Sabbath day had the Jewish Sabbath been instituted before that time. On this day we find them packing up in hot haste and hurrying out of Egypt; and then the Scriptures tell us that in memory of that day the Jewish Sabbath was instituted, (Deut. v. 15;) but it was not instituted for five weeks after this event. On the fourth week after this, on the same day of the week, and on the same day of the month, we find them travelling in the desert. (Ex. xv. 27, and Ex. xvi. 1.) Now, they either broke the Sabbath on this day, or the Jewish Sabbath was not then instituted.

But it will be answered that the fifteenth day of the second month was not a Sabbath day, as some of the commentators give the month Nisan thirty-one days. According to this, the fifteenth day of the

second month would fall on Tuesday, and not on Saturday. But we answer that we can prove beyond a shade of a doubt that the fifteenth day fell on a Saturday, and consequently the month Nisan must have contained but twenty-eight days.

1st, The commentaries do not agree as to the number of days Nisan contained; some giving twenty-nine days, others thirty, and others thirty-one. But little confidence can be placed where there is so much difference of opinion.

2d, "The Talmudists are generally of the opinion that the fifteenth day of the second month was the seventh day of the week."—*Patrick, Lowth, etc., Commentaries on Exodus* xvi. 1.

3d, Any person whose mind was not already prepossessed, on reading the sixteenth chapter of Exodus, would decide that the fifteenth day of the second month was the seventh day of the week. On that day the Israelites arrive at the wilderness of Sin, and murmur because they have no food. Then follow six days in which they are fed on manna, and the seventh day is the first Jewish Sabbath.

4th, Those Israelites who, from any ceremonial defilement, could not keep the Passover on the appointed day of the first month, were commanded to keep it on the same day of the second month. (Num. ix. 10, 11.) This law was observed by the nation in later years. (2 Chron. xxx. 2–15.) This proves that the days of the second month correspond with the days of the first month, otherwise the Sabbath would not be preceded by the Passover on the

occasions which fell on the fourteenth day of the month.

5th, The whole Jewish chronology was calculated from the Passover eve, or the full moon on that eve, when the Passover lamb was slain. Counting two weeks back from this time, brought the first day of the month, or new moon, on a Sabbath day. This new moon was the first day of the Jewish new year, for it was necessary that the year should begin with the new and not the full moon; otherwise the analogy of development and decay, between type and antitype would be completely destroyed. Now, counting forward from the exodus, brought the first day of the second month on a new moon, and consequently a Sabbath; and the fifteenth day on another full moon, and also a Sabbath day.

So far we have given inferences. Now we will give positive proof.

6th, Josephus says that the Israelites, on leaving Egypt, ate of the unleavened bread that they brought out of Egypt thirty days: and in the same section he calls the feast of unleavened bread "a feast of eight days," showing that he includes the day of the Passover as the first day of the feast. Now, if we count thirty days from the first day of the Passover, and including the first day, the last of the thirty will be the day that they arrived in the wilderness of Sin. This gives twenty-eight days for the month Nisan. The unleavened bread is exhausted on a seventh day, and they ate manna for the first time on the first day of the week, and sixteenth day of the second

month.—*Josephus, Jewish Antiquities*, Book 2, Chap. 15, Sec. 1.

7th, Now there can be no doubt but the fifteenth day of the first month was ever observed as a Sabbath day. Josephus says, "On the second day of unleavened bread, which is the sixteenth day of the month, they first partake of the fruits of the earth, for before that day they do not touch them."—*Josephus, Jewish Antiquities*, Book 3, Chap. 10, Sec. 5. And from Numbers xxiii. 15, we learn that this sixteenth day was the morrow after the Sabbath.

Now, from Leviticus xxiii. 39, we learn that the fifteenth day of the seventh month was a Sabbath day, and that the twenty-second was also a Sabbath day, although not one of the seven days of the feast of tabernacles; and consequently not called a Sabbath because it was a holy day, or great feast day, but because it was the regular seventh day Sabbath. This is also confirmed by the feast kept by Solomon at the dedication of the Temple, (2 Chron. vii. 8–11.) The people were sent away on the twenty-third day of the month, or first day of the week, being the first day after the conclusion of the feast. Now this brings the first Sabbath of the seventh month on the first day of the month, or a new moon. Now, having established the full moon of the first month on a Sabbath day, and the new moon of the seventh month on a Sabbath day, we have but to count five moons between the two in such a way that the Sabbath will fall on the new moon, or first day of the seventh month. Now there is only one way in which this can be done; that is, by giving twenty-

eight days to the first month, and alternately twenty-nine and thirty to the others. Thus we have undoubted proof that the Sabbath falls on the fifteenth day of the month. It may be objected that the fifth full moon does not invariably fall on the same day of the week. We do not claim that it does, nor is it necessary that it should to prove our ground. The full moon may have occurred any time during the day of the Passover, yet sunsetting of that day would be the time from which the Jews would begin to count. If we turn to the calendar of the year 1880, we will find that five times out of seven, four in succession, the full moon of the fifth month falls on the same day of the week:

BEGINNING.	ENDING.
Tuesday, January 27.	Tuesday, June 22.
Wednesday, February 25.	Wednesday, July 21.
Friday, March 26.	Friday, August 20.
Saturday, April 24.	Saturday, September 18.
Tuesday, June 22.	Tuesday, November 16.

We acknowledge that this is not always the case, and this want of uniformity may account for the discrepancies existing between the record of John and the other evangelists in regard to the time when our Lord partook of the last Passover with His disciples. When a discrepancy of this kind did occur, as it might occasionally, we do not know what arrangement the Jews had to overcome it. It is well known that in making up their years of twelve moons, they intercalated a thirteenth month every three years; and we presume they made a similar arrangement when the fifth moon, after the comple-

tion of the first two, did not fall on a Sabbath day, although I have at present no evidence that they did so. If they did, it would prove that the Jewish Sabbath was not the seventh day counting from the creation. We suspect, however, that these intercalary days, if there were such occasionally in making up the Jewish half year, falling, as they necessarily must do, on the Feast of New Moons, the two days were considered as a sort of double Sabbath. Again, we notice that on the first Sabbath of the first, second and seventh months, the two sacred days were combined in one, thus bringing them into most intimate relation with each other. (Amos viii. 5.)

Having now proved beyond all doubt that the fifteenth day of the second month, when the Israelites came into the wilderness of Sin, was the seventh day of the week, we ask, can any honest mind believe that the Jewish Sabbath was "an old statute that had fallen into disuse"? Is it possible that the Creator Himself could possibly trample upon His own statutes, and lead a whole nation, by cloudy pillar and column of fire, to break His laws, and then immediately command them to obey them under penalty of death? No! never! The fact is, that on that fifteenth day of the second month, no such law had as yet been given. The Israelites travelled on that day and broke no law. God's laws, after given, are immutable.

It is easy to understand why the Israelites, fleeing from the wrath of a nation enraged by the death of all its first-born, and cast out of Egypt by a powerful enemy, should spend the Sabbath in travelling;

and if true, as some suppose, they passed through the Red Sea on the night forming the fore part of a seventh day, they should again travel in order to escape from an enemy burning with revenge, determined to destroy or enslave them; but that the Holy Spirit in the guiding cloud on that quiet day in the wilderness, while the corpses of their enemies lay dead upon the sea shore, should lead them to break the holy Sabbath, and then, under penalty of death, forbid them to imitate His example, is perfectly incomprehensible, except upon the ground that the Jewish Sabbath was not yet instituted. We therefore submit to the consideration of the defenders of the Jewish Sabbath as an institution from the beginning of the world, whether the attribution of such a fickle, inconsistent character to a God of immutable justice is not a greater heresy than the denial of the Jewish Sabbath being a law given to man from the beginning.

The Jewish Type Fulfilled in the Christian Antitype.

We have observed that, if the Jewish Sabbath has been transferred into the Christian system, we are under obligations to keep Saturday instead of Sunday. But that the Jewish Sabbath is not binding upon us, is evident from Paul's language to the Colossians, "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holyday, or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days: which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." (The body which produces the shadow is Christ.) (Col. ii. 16,

17.) Paul is speaking here of the Jewish observance, which he terms "a shadow." He speaks of ceremonies and of the Jewish typical worship; but these have all passed away with the coming of Christ. The antitype has now taken the place of the type. Now, if we can prove that the Jewish Sabbath was a type of Christ, who gives us the true rest of the soul, then it is evident that it passed away with the coming of Christ.

But they tell us that the "sabbath days" mentioned in the passage are "Jewish festivals and holydays," and have no reference to the "seventh day of rest." If this is the case, let us substitute "holydays" for *sabbaths* in the passage, and see how it will read: "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holyday, or of the new moon, or of the *holydays:* which are a shadow of things to come." The tautology is too evident to need further refutation.

Then again, they tell us that the word is plural, *sabbaths*, and means the seventh year Sabbath and the Jubilee, whereas the seventh day is called, by way of pre-eminence, *The Sabbath.* (*The Holy Sabbath*, pages 36, 37.) This is certainly a strange way of reasoning. If we say that a man is diligent in business during the week days, do you understand by that that we exclude Mondays and Tuesdays because these are pre-eminently working days? If we say that a man observes the national holidays, do you understand us to say that he does not observe the Fourth of July, because that is pre-eminently the national holiday? The very fact that Paul made no

exceptions is superabundant proof that he meant all the Jewish Sabbaths. When Paul says the Sabbath days, he means *all* the Sabbath days, and not one Sabbath day out of thirty, which would have been the case if every seventh day Sabbath had been excluded. What one Jewish Sabbath was, that all Jewish Sabbaths were. They were all types of the same antitype, *shadows of the same body;* and unless there is clear and positive proof forthcoming that the seventh day Sabbath was a type of one thing, and the seventh year Sabbath and the Jubilee types of something entirely different, we must be pardoned if we believe that they were all fulfilled in the coming of Christ. No one who has not a pet theory to sustain would have ever thought that "sabbaths" in this passage meant monthly and yearly Sabbaths, and not *all* Jewish Sabbaths. When we see good men thus easily sliding unconsciously into error, we do well to search the Scriptures that we do not likewise depart from the truth.

The author of *The Holy Sabbath* says, "It is used in both places in connexion with eating or feasting; and nothing is said about eating or feasting in the sabbatic law." Paul is not speaking of feasting, but of taking food in a ritual sense, contrary to our Lord's own teachings to His disciples, that it is that which cometh out of the man that defileth him. (Matt. xv. 17–20; Romans xiv. 17.) But if he had turned to Lev. xxiii. 2, 3, he would there have found the Jewish Sabbath (seventh day) termed *a feast*, and one of the very "*feast days*" which, according to the writer, have been fulfilled in the coming of Christ.

But the "sabbaths" spoken of in Col. ii. 15, have no reference to the Lord's day. We understand that these Jewish Christians at this time were not only observing the Christian Lord's day, but also the Jewish Sabbath. This was the practice of many of the early Christians. The Ebionite Christians, who established themselves in Pella, after the destruction of Jerusalem, continued to observe two days in the week—the Jewish Sabbath and the Christian Lord's day—for two or three centuries after the Christian era. It is this practice which Paul here condemns, and has no reference whatever to the Lord's day, which it was proper and right for them to observe.

We now come to a more important argument, and again quote from *The Holy Sabbath*, page 30: "That it was not abolished . . . appears from the fact that it *cannot comply with the terms of abolition.* There is absolutely but one way to abolish a typical ordinance, and that is to fulfil it. Christ broadly asserted the rule when He said, 'I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil.' He arbitrarily and absolutely destroyed nothing. He only removed what was fulfilled, and because fulfilled. The shadow only gives place to the substance, the type to the antitype. Thus the sacrifices were not destroyed; they only gave place to the great atoning sacrifice of which they were shadows. The type is but another form of prophecy; and no prophecy can fall short of fulfilment. No type can vanish until it reaches the antitype. The Sabbath antedating the Mosaic economy, and being the prophecy and pledge of

future rest, cannot be abolished until it merges into the everlasting rest of heaven."

That a type is a prophecy that cannot be abolished until fulfilled in the antitype, is a truth which no one can question. But Paul declares that the Jewish shadows or types are fulfilled in the coming of Christ. The Jewish Sabbath, in memory of a rest from carnal bondage, is a type of that rest of the soul from the bondage of sin which our Saviour introduced into our world. The writer's great error here is that he supposes that "the everlasting rest in heaven" does not begin till after the death of the body. This is quite a prevalent error, and one which distorts many plain facts contained in the Scriptures. The court of the Jewish tabernacle was a type of childhood life under Christian training and example, until regeneration. The sanctuary was typical of a regenerated priesthood, and the holy of holies of heaven itself, and yet the division between the court and the "holy places" was much greater than that which separated the sanctuary from the holy of holies. And a careful student of the Scriptures cannot but observe that the whole tenor of Scripture indicates that regeneration, or the "new creation," as Paul styles it, is of ten-fold more importance than the transit of death. In fact, the great burden of prophecy relates to the former, while very little is said about the latter. Paul's declaration on this point is most emphatic: "There remaineth therefore a rest (literally, a keeping of the Sabbath) to the people of God." (Heb. iv. 9.) An examination of the context will show us that this passage refers to a

rest beginning here upon earth, and not confined exclusively to heaven; and that we enter it by regeneration, and not by death as is usually supposed. It would almost appear that theologians had rent God's kingdom asunder by the awful chasm which they introduce in the transit of death, of which God's word says very little indeed. Prophecies and parables relative to God's spiritual kingdom on earth should not be applied to His kingdom in heaven. This is the great error that would deprive us of a Sabbath, unless we accept the Jewish typical Sabbath-day rest of the body. The rest symbolized by the rest in Canaan, as well as of the seventh year Sabbath and Jubilee being fulfilled in the coming of Christ, we are left, according to their view, in a wide vacuum, which reaches from the crucifixion of our Lord to the morning of the general resurrection, with no visible fulfilment of the Jewish antitype this side of the grave. And yet they tell us that a part of the Jewish Sabbaths have been fulfilled. Fulfilled by what, pray?

"THERE REMAINETH THEREFORE A REST FOR THE PEOPLE OF GOD," IS NOT ALONE A REST IN HEAVEN, BUT A REST OF GRACE HERE ON EARTH.

Without even making a critical examination of the third and fourth chapters of Hebrews, and especially of the passage, "There remaineth therefore a rest for the people of God," one would suppose that it would be impossible for any person, even for a moment, to doubt that Paul is speaking here of a rest of the soul that remaineth for the people of God

when the Jewish type has been fulfilled in the antitype—Christ, who giveth His people rest from the power of sin and from the fear of death. But let us examine the passage carefully, and we cannot but be convinced that Paul is speaking of the rest of the New Covenant here on earth. The third chapter commences with a comparison of the champions of the two covenants, Moses and Christ; one a carnal leader and the other a spiritual guide. Moses is presented to us as a servant over a visible temporal nation, (house—family,) and Christ as a Son over a spiritual kingdom. "Moses verily was faithful in all his house as a servant, for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after; but Christ as a Son over His own house; whose house are we, if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end." Then follows a quotation from the ninety-fifth Psalm, stating the reason why many of the Israelites were not permitted to enter the land of Canaan. Now, if we are willing to accept the idea that the Jordan which separates the desert from the land of Canaan is not so much a type of the Jordan of death as of the Jordan of regeneration, we will see at once who were symbolized by those whose corpses fell in the desert, and why they fell there. Unbelief, that mighty arm in the hands of Satan, destroys them in the desert of Satan's kingdom, before they arrive at the point where regeneration takes place. Once having arrived safely in the spiritual kingdom of regeneration, they no longer fall by unbelief in the desert, according to our Calvinistic view of the perseverance of the saints. We

thus see where the shade of the Old Covenant, extending down into the New Testament Church, controls the lives and actions of those who have been trained under Christian influence from childhood, the leadership of Moses ceasing just where religion ceases to be felt binding as a duty, and Canaan commencing where service to God is felt to be a pleasure. The same reason may be given to-day why all who fall short of God's spiritual kingdom must perish outside of that kingdom. "They cannot enter in because of unbelief." But once safely in that kingdom here, they have entered into "that rest which remaineth for the people of God;" and they must first become the people of God by being drawn by His Spirit as were the children of Israel, and taught by the old school-master Moses, and become members of His kingdom on earth, or they can never enter His kingdom hereafter. First under the law, then under grace.

Then in the fourth chapter the analogy is still continued, showing that that rest towards which Moses led ancient Israel was not the true rest, but only a type of that rest which Christ gives His people here in this world. The language here is very simple indeed: "Let us [us Hebrews, for Paul is here addressing his own nation] therefore fear, lest, a promise being left us of entering into His rest, any of you should seem to come short of it. For unto us was the gospel preached, as well as unto them; but the word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it. For we which have believed do enter into rest."

[We Christians which have believed *do now* enter the rest of the spiritual Canaan.] Will any one pretend to tell us that Paul has only in view the rest after death? By no means. This rest is here, *now*. Believers in Christ Jesus enter into the rest of His spiritual kingdom by a rest from sin. The Apostle Paul entered this rest when he became a believer, and thousands of others were entering it when he penned this epistle, who did not enter heaven for many years after.

Then Paul quotes from David, whose Psalms were written long after the Israelites had entered the land of Canaan, to show that the true rest did not come in Joshua's time, but was still in the future. "For if Jesus [Joshua] had given them rest, then would he not afterward have spoken of another day. *There remaineth therefore a rest for the people of God.*" Then he tells them that as God entered into a period of rest after He had completed the work of creation, so Christ has now entered upon a period of rest after the work of redemption. "For he that is entered into his rest, he also hath ceased from his own works, as God did from His." This passage, as can be clearly seen from the context, refers not only to Christ, but the believer in Christ, who has already entered into rest, having "ceased from *his own works;*" his *own* works being the works of the law, while Christ's *own* work, the work which the Father gave Him to do, supplies, or gives efficacy to, the believer's works. The rest here, then, is a REST OF FAITH, the covenant of works being now fulfilled. Jesus, having finished the work of redemp-

tion, has now come into His spiritual kingdom. On the believer having ceased from the works of the law, he enters the spiritual priesthood; that is, he now no longer obeys the law through fear of punishment, but through love to its author, Christ.

Then follows an exhortation to the Hebrews, to strive to enter into that spiritual rest. "Let us [us Hebrews] labor therefore to enter into that rest, lest any man fall after the same example of unbelief." If Paul here means the regenerated believing Christians, and not the doubting Jews, then he strikes a blow at the Calvinistic doctrine of the perseverance of the saints, which we cannot admit, as the Scriptures everywhere teach that those who have fully entered upon this rest can no longer fall by unbelief in the desert. All falling from grace must be confined to the covenant of works, and excluded from the covenant of faith. (I mean by "covenant of works" the covenant of Sinai, which I believe to include both typical Israel and its antitype the baptized children of the Church in the Christian dispensation, and not the covenant made with Adam. Salvation, however, is by grace, and not by works, under all dispensations. There can be no redemption without a Redeemer—"the only Redeemer of God's elect.")

Nor is this language alone to be found in the fourth chapter of the Hebrews. The Scriptures are full of similar expressions. "Strive to enter in at the strait gate," does not mean to enter the gate of heaven after death, but the gate of Christ's kingdom here on earth. When Christ says, "I am the door,"

He does not only mean that He is the door of the kingdom of glory after death, but He is the door by which the believer enters His kingdom of salvation here on earth; not the door of heaven; but the door of His spiritual fold. "I am the true vine," Christ says to those who were yet under the old covenant, some of which would yet be broken away on account of unbelief; but those who remained would be purged by the word (that is, regenerated), and then bear much fruit, not in heaven, but here on earth, in the conversion of the Gentiles.

This rest is a rest from the works of the law; a rest from sin; a rest of grace. As Moses led the Israelites to a rest in Canaan, so Christ leads us to the rest of His kingdom here. We must first labor in Moses' school, and then rest in Christ's kingdom on earth, or we can never rest in heaven, unless we die in infancy, before having rebelled against known light; and even then our salvation is purchased by the blood of Christ. It is true that the Israelites never enjoyed a complete rest in Canaan. They were almost continually at war, either with the Philistines within their own land or with foreign powers, or engaged in terrible combat with each other; nor do we enjoy a complete rest from sin under the new covenant. Sin is in our members; and if he cannot control us with the authority of a master, he will show us at least that he only submits as an unruly slave to a power stronger than himself; therefore we see that the analogy drawn between our present rest and that of the Jews in Canaan is perfect in every particular. Nevertheless, the rest which Paul tells

the Hebrews "remaineth for the people of God," is that rest which Christ promises to those who come to Him by faith: "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and *ye shall find rest unto your souls.* For my yoke is easy and my burden is light." Man must partake of the tree of life and be healed by the medicinal virtue of its leaves before he enters the portal of the tomb, or he can never enjoy its blessed fruits in "the power of an endless life."

What Relation does the Lord's Day bear to the Rest of the New Covenant?

The New Covenant rest bears the same relation to the Lord's day that the rest in Canaan bore to the Jewish Sabbath. It is the basis or foundation upon which the Lord's day is built. As God rested after the work of creation, so Christ rested after the work of redemption. Now, we maintain that the rest from the labor of creation was a long period, passing through several thousand years; so Christ's rest is a period commencing with the morn of His resurrection from Joseph's tomb, and ending with the consummation of all terrestrial affairs.

But God did not rest from work in the full sense of the term. He continued to sustain that which He had created. Christ says, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." As the Father created the world and continued to sustain it, so Christ redeemed the world, and now comes in the form of the Holy Spirit to support and sustain all regenerated believers.

Now, if we wish to know what relation the Lord's day bears to the rest of grace which Christ has introduced, we must first learn what relation the Jewish Sabbath bears to the rest in Canaan, and then carry out the analogy, and the whole question will become perfectly plain.

The whole Jewish system consisted in a separation of a part, as a symbol, that the whole should be consecrated to the Lord. One nation from among all the nations of the earth was chosen as a symbol of all nations. One son, the eldest of the family, was chosen as a priest, and to some extent the king or ruler of the whole family. (This rule in the case of Jacob's family, however, was set aside, most likely, on account of sins committed by the eldest son against his father, and the tribes of Judah and Levi were chosen instead to these offices.) The first fruits of their harvest were consecrated to God as a symbol of the whole harvest being His own property. Certain animals were considered by them as holy, and certain vessels were supposed, by having been passed through a ceremonial purification, to have become more holy than others; while all implements used in the tabernacle and temple service were consecrated to God as holy. Their own land, above all other lands, was in a typical and symbolical sense that which truly bore the inappropriate title applied to it to-day—"*The Holy Land.*" A certain city was to them "The Holy City," being a symbol of all cities, as well as a type of "that Jerusalem which is from above" in the worship of true believers; but in her destruction by Titus, for apostasy, she became

a type of the destruction of Satan's empire—Great Babylon. We also find that the first-born of all cattle was also consecrated to God, as a symbol indicating that all the flocks of the field were at His service whenever He should demand them.

Now, in regard to time, one day in seven was consecrated to God as a first-fruits of all their time, in memory of that first day of the new period in which God rested from the creation of the world; this day being, if we may so express it, an outgrowth of that long period of rest. It was also a memory of the first day of freedom from Egyptian bondage, and, as might be expected, ended the last day of the Old Covenant; that day in which the world's Creator, having now taken upon Himself the work of becoming the world's Redeemer, was laid away in the cold and silent grave. This Sabbath day was also a type of that "first day" of the more glorious rest which follows it—the first day of man's redemption.

Now, if we follow up the same chain of evidences, we will learn from the Jewish law what day observed by the Jews was in the end to be developed into the Lord's day, and by the manner in which they observed that day, together with the prophecies, we learn how the Lord's day should be observed by us.

The Jewish Pentecost a Germ of the Lord's Day.

As the giving of the manna in the desert was so intimately connected with the institution of the Jewish Sabbath, we naturally look to its cessation for at least one of the roots which in the end shall develop into the Lord's day. From Joshua v. 10–12, we

learn that the Israelites kept the Passover in the plains of Jericho on the fourteenth day of the month Nisan, and that on the morrow, or Sabbath day, they ate of the old corn of the land, and that on the next day, corresponding with our Lord's day, the manna ceased. This was the day on which, in future years, the wave offering was to be presented. Just forty-nine days from that day was to be the day of Pentecost.

Now, as the Jewish Sabbath was instituted in commemoration of the exodus from Egyptian bondage, and at the giving of the manna, after the unleavened bread they brought with them out of Egypt had been exhausted: so we find the Pentecost established in the land of Canaan, which was but a type of the true rest which should come in the future, although the unbelieving Jews of Paul's time thought that it was that true rest, in commemoration of that rest which they had entered fifty days before. The Jewish Sabbath being the seventh day rest, the Pentecost could be observed only yearly; but even in this yearly observance we see it clearly indicated as an outgrowth of the rest which they now enjoyed in Canaan. Now, if we observe carefully the two days which form the feast of Pentecost, the sixteenth day of the month Nisan and the eighth of the month Sivan, we cannot fail to see their close relationship to the two covenants. (Lev. xxiii. 9–21.) The first was connected with the Passover, a day on which all leaven was excluded, and the first-fruits were consecrated to God, not in the loaf, but in the sheaf; but on the latter day, not one sheaf, but two loaves, were

to be presented, baked with leaven, and consequently just the reverse of the feast of the Passover. Every thing connected with the Passover indicates an unfinished work, while everything connected with the Pentecost denotes a complete work. Now, as the Jewish Sabbath belongs to the Mosaic system instituted in the desert, and the Pentecost falling not upon the last but the first day of the week, and foreshadowing the light or leavened bread of a better rest, we consider that this day could be none other than a foretaste of the Christian Lord's day. In the Pentecost we find the very opposite of the Passover. The latter was a day of exclusion, quiet, separation; and the other, it is true, a day of exclusion from servile work, but yet a day of activity, of permeation. One bearing the sad remembrance of the death of the first-born in Egypt, the other of new life in the land of Canaan; one symbolizing the unleavened bread of sorrow and affliction—of weariness and hunger in the desert, the other of the light bread of joy and peace in their own home in Canaan; one a symbol of death, the other a symbol of life.

Now, if our reasoning is correct, we can have no doubt that the day of Pentecost was a basis of the Christian's Lord's day, rather than the Jewish Sabbath, just as the Jewish synagogue was the basis of the Christian church, rather than the temple at Jerusalem. In both these cases the shadow or type passed away, while the germs are retained in their full development in the Christian system. If such is the case, then the laws concerning the Pentecost have an intimate connection with the Lord's day.

We read: "And ye shall have an holy convocation; ye shall do no servile work therein." "And thou shalt keep a feast of weeks unto the Lord thy God, with a tribute of a free-will offering of thine hand, which thou shalt give unto the Lord thy God, according as the Lord thy God hath blessed thee. And thou shalt rejoice before the Lord thy God, thou and thy son, and thy daughter, and thy man-servant and thy maid-servant, and the Levite that is within thy gates, and the stranger, and the fatherless, and the widow, that are among you, in the place which the Lord thy God hath chosen." (Lev. xxiii. 21; Num. xxviii. 26; Deut. xvi. 9–12.) Is it a strange thing, then, if we find similar precepts in the New Testament in regard to the Lord's day? Paul says: "Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store as God hath prospered him." (1 Cor. xvi. 1–2.)

Most commentators suppose that the law was given from Sinai on the day of Pentecost. Even Mr. Atwater, in his admirable work on the Jewish Tabernacle, says: "Fifty days after the exodus from Egypt, Moses received on Sinai the two tables of stone on which God had inscribed the Ten Commandments."—*The Sacred Tabernacle*, page 2. Is there any proof of this? Does Exodus xix. 1 mean the first day of the third month, or does it mean the same day of the month that the Israelites left Egypt? In either case, it would be the first day of the week; but the former gives too little, and the latter too

much. But no matter; the Pentecost was an outgrowth of the rest in Canaan, and was not observed in the desert, and had no other connection with it than being given there in anticipation, as the law concerning cities of refuge, and similar laws, to be enforced only in their own land. Pentecost did not exist at the time the law was given. That people should confound the giving of the law in the desert with the rejoicing over the first-fruits of Canaan, is so far out of place that we wonder that any one should ever have imagined such a thing.

As a temperance question, it has been maintained by the defenders of total abstinence that the Jewish law concerning the feast of the Passover required the entire expulsion of not only leavened bread, but of anything that partook of the nature of leaven; consequently of all fermented wine, and, therefore, Christ on the night of His betrayal partook with His disciples of the unfermented juice of the grape, and not of fermented wine; that the apostles must have followed His example, and only later ages have departed from it. On the other hand, it has been maintained by those who take a different view, that there can be no doubt that the early Corinthian church used fermented wine, and Paul does not censure them because they used fermented wine, but because they got drunk on it. Now the facts of the case are just these: that the Jews used no leaven or fermented wine at the Passover, but they used both on the day of Pentecost, and the apostles continued to do so. The present practice of using unleavened bread, then, at our communion table is unwarranted

by the practice of the apostles. As the Passover lamb was the symbol of death, so now light bread is a symbol of life, Christ, the true Bread, giving us life by His resurrection from the grave. The unleavened bread brought out of Egypt by the Israelites could not give them life, even in the desert, but was soon exhausted, leaving them on the point of perishing of famine in the desert; therefore the Bread of Life, the true Bread from heaven, should be symbolized by something more palatable than that which Israel carried out of Egypt. In defence of the cause of temperance, let it be said that no harm can come from a truthful statement of the case. If, on account of temptation, it be thought best to depart from the early practice of the apostles, there can be no harm in doing so, as long as we have the sanction of the apostles themselves. In 1 Cor. viii. and x. 19–33, we find Paul countermanding a decree given by the first council at Jerusalem, in regard to meats consecrated to idols, and yet he says: "If meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend." May God give us all strength of mind and will to use no intoxicating liquor, or anything else, that may cause a weak brother to stumble and fall!

Now, if we are correct thus far, that Pentecost was really a germ of the Lord's day, then we must expect to find in the first Pentecost which Christ's people held after His ascension, and after having brought them into the spiritual Canaan, a confirmation of the Lord's day, then and there instituted in all its plenitude, in commemoration of the morning

of His resurrection, when He delivered them from the spiritual bondage of sin. As the day of Pentecost had been observed up to this time as a season of returning thanks to God for His bounties, and for the deliverance of His ancient people from Egypt, (Deut. xvi. 12,) we may expect to find the apostles celebrating the day in its true spiritual sense. We find a full record of this event in the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, and cannot doubt but it is an example for the members of God's spiritual kingdom through all coming time.

No consecrated temple was needed for this service, as the Jewish synagogue had now culminated in the Christian church. No chosen family like that of Levi officiated there, nor first-born anointed with consecrated oil and clothed with symbolical vestments, but the first-fruits of Christ's ministry, anointed with the Holy Spirit descending visibly upon them in the form of cloven (not single) tongues like as of fire, to show the world that they had a double mission to perform: 1st, to proclaim the law, whose end is death; and 2d, to present the remedy—the gospel, which gives life.

We behold here no flocks of cattle, sheep or birds; no altar with its flames of fire and columns of black smoke; no costly array of smoking incense; no wonderful ceremonies or peculiar forms of dress, but a powerful sermon, backed up by proofs from the Old Testament Scriptures, converting three thousand Old Covenant Jews, not away from the Mosaic ritual, not into modern Christians, free from all Jewish prejudices, but to faith in a risen Saviour,

who was undoubtedly the Messiah they had long been looking for.

This Lord's day was spent in God's service as no Jewish Sabbath had ever been. It was not so much a Sabbath of bodily observances, a rest from manual labor, as a Sabbath of the soul.

The Christian Lord's Day an Outgrowth of the New Covenant System.

In Christ's Sabbath of grace no costly temple or temple service is required. The blue dome of heaven is God's temple, while towering mountains and rolling hills are its arches; carpeted by the green sward, and lighted, not by seven golden candlesticks, but by the seven prismatic colours of light, streaming from the radiant face of the king of day; all nature rolls up one universal anthem of praise to the great Creator, proclaiming that not in temples made with hands, either in Mount Gerizim or at Jerusalem, do the true worshippers worship the Father in spirit and in truth. In the New Covenant no commands are given to any Solomon about the building of temples. God's spiritual temple is universal, and yet a synagogue or church is required where men can congregate for the study of God's word. We know this from the practice of the apostles and early Christians, although there are given no directions about building it. It is not the Jewish temple transferred into the New Covenant system, but the germ which existed in the Jewish synagogue that is now developed into the Christian church.

In the New Testament dispensation nothing is

said about a chosen priesthood initiated into the duties of his office by a ceremonial purification and the anointing of oil, nevertheless Christ's spiritual kingdom is a priesthood, "a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices;" "a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people," (1 Pet. ii. 5–9,) out of which, as an outgrowth of the Christian system, has come the Christian ministry, corresponding with the Christian church and the Lord's day; and yet no one will pretend to say that the Christian ministry is nothing more than the Levitical priesthood transferred to the Christian system. Such an assumption would at once be met with ridicule. Nor will any one for a moment admit that the Christian ministry is less honorable, or the position less sacred, than that of the Jewish priest. In fact, the antitype is infinitely superior to the type. The very first-fruits of the "holy nation" should be consecrated to God for this purpose. Not the spiritually halt and maimed, but the man of firm character and noble purpose, in whose eye beams the fire of intellect, whose mind, thoroughly trained in the requisite institutions for imparting human knowledge, shall have obtained all the acquirements possessed by the apostles, and then profoundly imbued with God's Holy Spirit, and baptized with the living water of life—God's living word—he may be able to proclaim, with power from on high, the gospel plan of salvation to a ruined world. Oh, this mission is infinitely superior, and infinitely more holy, than that of a typical Jewish priest offering typical sacrifices on a typical altar in the temple of ancient Jerusalem!

As in the New Covenant all space is holy to God, and all regenerated believers are a spiritual priesthood, so all time should be consecrated to His service. All time is holy, and should be considered a holy rest from sin, that true "Sabbath which remaineth for the people of God" after the Jewish Sabbath and the rest in material Canaan have all been taken away. And yet, as an outgrowth of the Christian system, there is one day in seven, the Christian Lord's day, which is especially holy, a day to be observed above all others by His people, as consecrated to His service, and in which they are particularly required to engage in the duties pertaining to His Church and ministry. This day is not the Jewish Sabbath transferred to the New Covenant, but a new day, chosen for the purpose, and in itself an outgrowth of the Christian system. This day is not so much a rest of the body as it is a rest of the soul. Now, just as the Christian church is not a transfer of the Jewish temple, but is peculiar to the New Covenant; just as the Christian ministry is not a transfer of the Levitical priesthood, but is a part of the Christian dispensation; so the Lord's day is not a transfer of the Jewish Sabbath, but a day originating out of the necessities of the New Testament dispensation.

The Lord's Day More Holy than the Jewish Sabbath.

We would not detract one iota from the proper observance of the Lord's day. What the Scriptures demand, that is our duty to teach, and as far as possible to enforce. But the Lord's day is the Sab-

bath of the soul, and as such the soul of the believer should be so absorbed in the duties of the day, that the day will be observed and sanctified by him without the necessity of any outward command to obey it. In fact, there is no command in the New Testament to observe the day. Such a commandment would be out of place in the New Testament economy. (See Jer. xxxi. 33–34.) Let the State enforce what laws it sees proper to keep miscreant nominal Christians, Jews and infidels out of mischief, but he whose soul is baptized in Christ needs no such laws. Let the State adhere to the morality of the Old Testament, but our duty as Christian believers is to the morality of the New Covenant. We live not under the fear of the law, but above the law. People who are under the law would run into anarchy were the law to be abolished, but the morality of the New Covenant Christian would undergo no change were all laws to be annihilated.

But the question may be asked, "If the Lord's day is to be observed with as much attention and respect as was the Jewish Sabbath, why defend the view that a new day has been chosen, and not the Jewish Sabbath transferred? What is to be gained?" We answer, We gain the truth. We present the teachings of the Bible. We destroy not only this error, but others that may grow out of it. We show more distinctly the relations existing between the two Covenants, and make it more difficult for men to confound the one with the other.

To the true believer, then, the Lord's day is a Sabbath of the soul. He becomes so absorbed in the

gospel and its privileges and duties that he is completely drawn away from all desire to prosecute his own business or pleasure on that day. But the Church has not alone to deal with Pentecostal believers. Her influence extends over a large class, who, to a certain extent, yet belong to that shade of the Old Covenant which still exists along with the New. We mean children and young people, and perhaps some older persons, who, like the Hebrews that Paul wrote to, are still in the desert, travelling, it is true, towards Canaan, but who are nevertheless exposed to the danger of falling through unbelief and perishing in the desert. For all such, we need still to proclaim the law written upon stone: "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy," not in its typical character as a remembrance of Israel's departure from the land of bondage, but in its prophetical character as a remembrance of Him who died and rose again for them, and that through belief in Him they may enter into rest and be saved from their sins.

The Jewish Sabbath a Symbol of Death; the Lord's Day a Symbol of Life.

We now come to another aspect of the case. The Jewish Sabbath was a terrible memento of death—death in Egypt. The destroying angel was at work on that terrible night when Israel left Egypt, and the Jewish Sabbath was instituted as a monument of the sad events of that night. In every house there was a corpse, and that corpse was the first-born of every family; literally, the first-born of the

nation. The Egyptians, doubtless observing the same rules which prevailed among the early Hebrews, considered the first-born as the consecrated priesthood of the nation, and a symbol of the entire nation itself. If such was the case, then Pharaoh saw in the death of the first-born the condemnation of the entire nation to death. And the language of Scripture would rather bear out this view: "And the Egyptians were urgent upon the people, that they might send them out of the land in haste: for they said, *We be all dead men.*" (Ex. xii. 33.) "In every house was a corpse," and that corpse spake louder than words could possibly do of the doom of the nation. Friends and relatives gathered in awful sorrow around their dead, not so much, perhaps, in mourning for the dead as in dread anticipation of their own doom. The day which followed that terrible night indicated to the Hebrews an escape from death, but an escape that was not consummated until they had passed the Red Sea and were safe on their way to Canaan; and which is not spiritually confirmed to us until we have passed the red sea close by the cross of Christ.

The last Jewish Sabbath, consummating the period before the Christian era, was also a terrible memento of death. The First-born of Creation, the only begotten Son of God, lay in the cold embrace of death in the new tomb of Joseph of Arimathea. In His sad fate His disciples read their own condemnation. If He were an imposter, as they now supposed, all their inheritance in Israel was destroyed; and all their expectations lay buried with Christ in

His tomb. Nor was this sad night and day of mourning alone confined to the twelve disciples. All who had looked to Him as their Messiah were in mourning. The fate of the carnal Jewish nation was sealed. The carnal first-born lay in the tomb in Egypt on that day which was the origin of the Jewish Sabbath, and on this last Sabbath day the carnal hope of Israel had perished for ever. During that long day, Christ's friends, if they met at all, only met to tell one another of their great sorrow. But, as is natural to suppose, a Sabbath whose origin was in death could but end in death. The first-born of the Egyptian was an appropriate symbol of the whole Adamic nature, and the First-born of God, having assumed that nature, dies in it.

But the history of that terrible night in Egypt is not an old story. It is a terrible reality, whose solemn shadow falls upon us now. Egypt is all around us to-day. The solemn hover of the wings of the death angel is wafted to us by every breeze. The world is perishing around us. The mother, as she sits by the cradle of her dying first-born watching for its last breath; the daughter soothing the fevered brow of a dear father while undergoing the agony of the last hour; the husband clinging with the grasp of despair to the loving wife as he sees her borne away in the jaws of the terrible monster; a sister in awful agony watching for the last gasp of a loved brother—are all passing through that solemn night of Egypt's profoundest darkness. And does not the fate of these dear ones, as they are torn away from our embrace, reveal to us our own death

sentence? Who can look upon the face of the dying and not read there the sentence of his own condemnation? And who can stand among the dead, in the midst of Egyptian darkness, and not repeat the echo, "We be all dead men"?

But the first Christian Lord's day, made glorious by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the grave, is a symbol of life. Life from God, through the grave on that day, and confirmed to the Church of the First-born on the day of Pentecost in the descent of God's Holy Spirit, gives to the world a day of spiritual rejoicing the exact counterpart of the Old Covenant Sabbath. The Jewish Sabbath belongs to the law, whose beginning and end is death. The Lord's day belongs to the gospel, whose beginning is life eternal. The Jewish Sabbath ends with the death of the Son of man. The Lord's day begins with the resurrection of the Son of God. The Jewish Sabbath ends with the Son of David, and, in fact, the last of David's carnal seed reposing in the tomb. The Lord's day begins with David's risen Lord, and the day of Pentecost confirms Him upon His throne in the hearts of all true believers. Our Lord's day is not a feast of unleavened bread, eaten in hot haste and burning desire to escape from a carnal bondage, but a feast of light bread, in commemoration of eternal liberty through Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God. Our Lord's day is not a symbol of the gloom and terror of the grave, but of life—life eternal.

Judaism, from beginning to end, contained but the lifeless form of a carnal Christ. If any Jew,

from Abraham to Christ, ever obtained eternal life, it was only through a risen and glorified Saviour, a reflection of whose image was carried back into the Old Covenant by the writings of the prophets and the images of the ceremonial law, just as the moon and planets reflect the light of the sun into the darkness of the night. But now the night has passed and the day has come. "Awake, thou that sleepest, and Christ shall give thee light."

The Jewish Sabbath a Symbol of Darkness; the Lord's Day a Symbol of Light.

It has been observed that the Jewish Sabbath commenced with the setting of the sun on Friday night, and ended with the setting of the sun on Saturday night. It is evident, then, that the Jewish Sabbath commenced with the night, the first half being night and the latter half day. If we turn to the history of creation, as recorded in the first chapter of Genesis, we will read that "the evening and the morning" were the "first day," "second day," etc. This idea corresponds beautifully with the Old and New Covenants. The dark tempestuous night of Egypt was illumined only by the angry flames of Sinai. After the dark clouds of Egypt and the desert have passed away, the bright stars of Canaan break forth in the light of its kings and prophets, reflecting back the image of the coming Sun of Righteousness; and even when the Sun rises and the New Covenant comes in, there is still a shadow of the Old Covenant accompanying every object that intercepts the Sun's rays. It was in memory of a

dark and terrible night, when Israel went out of Egypt, that resulted in the institution of the Jewish Sabbath. It was amid the wail of a nation mourning for its first-born that they packed up their goods and hastened away, lest the avenging angel of death should overtake them also. And then the morning finds them wandering in the desert; homeless, sad, and dreary, not knowing whither they were going. It was also in the night time that they passed through the Red Sea, and on the morning they stood upon those barren shores and beheld the corpses of their enemies wafted to the shore by the impetuosity of the overwhelming waves; and many commentators suppose—from an inference to be derived from Deut. v. 15, when the Angel of the Covenant in the fiery pillar ceases to be their leader and now becomes their protector, they having been driven into the sea by Pharaoh's army, just as Christ was forced into His grave at the commencement of a Jewish Sabbath by His enemies—that Israel passed through the Red Sea on a Sabbath day also.

The Christian Lord's day commences with the morning. It was early morn when Mary came to the Saviour's tomb. It was early in the morning when the news of a Saviour's resurrection broke upon the ears of His astonished disciples. Glorious morning, that gave the world a Saviour! A morning whose light, reflected back into the depths of Old Testament prophecy, reveals the mystery hidden from the ages under shadow and symbol, and now clearly brought to view by the gospel; a morning revealing to our race the life and immortality which

is the heritage of the righteous; a morning to be closed by no night to those who are sons of God by faith, but at the same time revealing to the wicked a night more terrible than the darkness of Egypt. Now, if the Old Testament night was a long period, symbolized by the Jewish Sabbath, then the morning of the New Covenant is a long rest, most appropriately symbolized by the Lord's day. Away back in the middle of the Jewish night, one of the disciples of Moses, groaning under the heavy burden of the law, exclaims: "Watchman, what of the night? Watchman, what of the night?" (Isa. xxi. 11, 12.) And then a voice comes back through the still darkness: "The morning cometh;" and then, as though echoing from the profoundest depths of Egyptian dungeons, to seal the destiny of those who love the "darkness rather than the light," and who "will not come to the light lest their deeds should be reproved," comes the solemn announcement, "*and also the night*,"—night of eternal wrath to all who reject Him who is the Light of the world.

But when the morning had come, and the Jewish nation, with all its ordinances, was about to crumble into dust, one of the "sons of the morning" cries, "Love is the fulfilling of the law; . . . awake out of sleep; . . . the night is far spent, the day is at hand." (Rom. xiii. 10–14.) And then he says to those who are in Christ, "Ye are all the children of light and the children of the day: we are not of the night, nor of darkness." (1 Thess. v. 1–7.)

THE PROPER OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY MAY BE LEARNED FROM THE PROPHETS AS WELL AS FROM THE MOSAIC LAW.

As has already been observed, in the gospel as presented to us in the New Testament, we find no rules for the observance of the Lord's day. Such rules would be out of place in the gospel. Christ, while teaching those who were still under the old dispensation, enjoined the most strict observance of the moral law, including the Fourth Commandment. This we observe in the answer given to the lawyer who came to Him tempting Him (Matt. xxii. 34–40), as well as elsewhere; and the plain inference is that this commandment, made free from the typical, was to extend down into the new dispensation. Besides this, all we have in the New Testament relative to the matter is the example given us by the apostles; and even this example is not always to be relied on, the apostles themselves varying as they were influenced more or less by Judaism, as we find in the case of Peter, as recorded in the tenth chapter of the Acts, refusing even at that late date to associate with Gentiles and partake of their food, giving as a reason that nothing unclean had ever passed his mouth, although his Lord had told him, ten or twelve years before this, that it is not that which entereth the man that defileth him. Now we have already seen that the Mosaic economy, consisting of types and shadows, has been fulfilled in the New Covenant, and in it the Jewish Sabbath, as a type of the rest of grace "which remaineth for the people of God."

But Moses and the New Testament do not comprise the whole of the Bible. There were *two* witnesses before the New Testament was in existence, which were often quoted by our Lord—"Moses and the prophets"—and as one of these has been fulfilled, we naturally turn to the other. The prophets, then, being an introduction to the gospel, must, if carefully examined, afford us all the rules we require to know on this subject; and as we are especially told that the New Covenant Church is "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself (in whom Moses is fulfilled) being the chief corner stone." (Eph. ii. 20–22.) But as these prophecies were given to the Jewish or typical kingdom, and, as their name (prophecies) indicates, refer to the spiritual kingdom of Christ, they must be taken in a spiritual and not in a material sense. Let us, then, examine in detail the prophecies relative to the Lord's day. One of the most important of these is to be found in Jeremiah xvii. 19–27:

"Thus saith the Lord unto me, Go and stand in the gate of the children of the people, whereby the kings of Judah come in, and by the which they go out, and in all the gates of Jerusalem: and say unto them, Hear ye the word of the Lord, ye kings of Judah, and all Judah and all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, that enter in by these gates; thus saith the Lord, Take heed to yourselves, and bear no burden on the Sabbath day, nor bring it in by the gates of Jerusalem; neither carry forth a burden out of your houses on the Sabbath day, neither do ye any work, but hallow ye the Sabbath day, as I commanded your

fathers. But they obeyed not, neither inclined their ear, but made their necks stiff, that they might not hear, nor receive instruction. And it shall come to pass, if ye diligently hearken unto me, saith the Lord, to bring in no burden through the gates of this city on the Sabbath day, but hallow the Sabbath day to do no work therein; then shall there enter into the gates of this city kings and princes sitting upon the throne of David, riding in chariots and on horses, they and their princes, the men of Judah, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem: and this city shall remain for ever. And they shall come from the cities of Judah, and from the places about Jerusalem, and from the land of Benjamin, and from the plain, and from the mountains, and from the south, bringing burnt offerings, and sacrifices, and meat offerings, and incense, and bringing sacrifices of praise, unto the house of the Lord. But if ye will not hearken unto me to hallow the Sabbath day, and not to bear a burden, even entering in at the gates of Jerusalem on the Sabbath day; then will I kindle a fire in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem, and it shall not be quenched."

Now here let us note several things which do not appear on the surface of this passage to a superficial reader:

1st, This is not merely an historical sketch of events transpiring in the days of Josiah and Jehoiakim, kings of Judah. If it were, it would be of but little value to us. In fact, it would not be what God's word claims to be, a communication from God to fallen man concerning his soul's salvation, and

which deeply concerns every member of the human family throughout all ages.

2d, It is a *prophecy*, and, as a prophecy, given ostensibly to a typical nation is virtually to be fulfilled in all the nations of the world, of which that nation is a type, according to God's own words to Jeremiah: "I ordained thee a prophet unto *the nations*." "See, I have this day set thee over *the nations* and over the *kingdoms*, to root out and to destroy, and to throw down, to build, and to plant." (Jer. i. 5 and 10.) This prophecy, then, has its fulfilment in the spiritual kingdom of Christ, and not in the material type.

3d, As the language is addressed to the type to be fulfilled in the antitype, the Jerusalem spoken of is "that Jerusalem which is from above," and not the material Jerusalem, and the "Sabbath day" referred to is the Lord's day, and the "burdens" which are not to be carried into the spiritual Jerusalem on the Lord's day are not packages of rice and sugar, but mental burdens—worldly affairs—all thoughts of worldly business and worldly cares.

4th, That view which would make this prophecy to be fulfilled literally in the future in the restoration of ancient Jerusalem betrays such ignorance of the prophecies that it requires no refutation. Ancient Jerusalem is not to be rebuilt. The type having been fulfilled in the antitype, has accomplished its purpose, and has passed away for ever.

5th, This prophecy is having its fulfilment to-day. The "princes sitting upon the throne of David" are those who occupy high positions in the gospel king-

dom; Jerusalem being none other than the gospel Church.

A similar passage is to be found in Isaiah lvi. 1–8: "Thus saith the Lord, Keep ye judgment, and do justice; for My salvation is near to come, and My righteousness to be revealed. Blessed is the man that doeth this, and the son of man that layeth hold on it; that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and keepeth his hand from doing any evil. Neither let the son of the stranger, that hath joined himself to the Lord, speak, saying, The Lord hath utterly separated me from His people: neither let the eunuch say, Behold, I am a dry tree. For thus saith the Lord unto the eunuchs that keep My Sabbaths, and choose the things that please Me, and take hold of My covenant, Even unto them will I give in Mine house and within My walls a place and a name better than of sons and of daughters: I will give them an everlasting name, that shall not be cut off. Also the sons of the stranger, that join themselves to the Lord, to serve Him, and to love the name of the Lord, to be His servants, every one that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and taketh hold of My covenant; even them will I bring to My holy mountain, and make them joyful in My house of prayer: their burnt offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon Mine altar: for Mine house shall be called a house of prayer for *all people*."

Isaiah, above all other prophets, has been most appropriately termed the evangelical prophet; the latter portion of his prophecies, especially, referring to the gathering of the spiritual seed of Abraham

(not the carnal Jews) from among all nations. This passage, then, like the former from Jeremiah, is to be interpreted as referring to the proper observance of the Lord's day, although ostensibly addressed to the type, as are a majority of the prophecies, to be fulfilled in the antitype. This view is still more clearly seen in the following passage: "For as the new heavens and the new earth [the gospel kingdom] which I will make, shall remain before Me, saith the Lord, so shall your seed and your name remain. And it shall come to pass, that from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before Me, saith the Lord." (Isa. lxvi. 22, 23.)

And still more decisive is the following: "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on My holy day: and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable; and shalt honor Him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words; then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." (Isa. lviii. 13, 14.) Here, then, we have in the prophecies of the Old Testament, being an introduction to the gospel, all the commands necessary for the observance of the Lord's day; commands which would not be proper in the gospel itself, which deals with a purely spiritual kingdom. Not discarding Moses, but considering him as purely typical of the gospel, we will find in the prophecies all that we need to

know concerning the dedication of one-seventh of our time to the Lord, and just how this time should be observed.

We have, then, as a guide to the proper observance of the Lord's day:

1st, *The Fourth Commandment;* not to be taken in its material typical sense as given to the Jews through Moses, but in its application to the antitype as given through Christ to the world.

2d, *The commands given to the Jews in regard to the observance of the Pentecost;* also to be taken in a spiritual and not in a material sense.

3d, *All commands given by the prophets concerning the Jewish Sabbath*, having passed through the prism of the cross, and applied to the Lord's day in the light of the New Covenant.

4th, The practice of the apostles.

All scriptural prophecies become perfectly plain if we remember the simple rule of substituting the name of the antitype in the place of the type. Let us try that rule on some of the prophecies relative to the Lord's day, and witness the result. Take, for instance, the passage in Isaiah just referred to, Isa. lviii. 13.

The Proper Observance of the Lord's Day.

1st, *We are not to turn from the day by seeking our own pleasure.*

All our business affairs are to be laid aside on this day. We may legitimately occupy the six intervening days in the pursuit of worldly treasure necessary for our own comfort and that of our families, but

this day is especially to be dedicated to God's work, and not to our own. On this day our own fortunes, or, in other words, our own petty kingdoms, are at rest. We are not to think of them this day, but to spend the day in laboring for the advancement of God's kingdom, and the building up of His cause in the world. On the Lord's day the merchant should be as faithful in the Lord's field of labor as he has been in his store or counting-room during the other six days of the week, and the clerk must be as diligently engaged in the Lord's service as he has been during the six days in his employer's business. It is not to be a day of idleness, but of intense activity; in fact, we should be more active on this day than on others, for we serve a higher master, and engage in a far more noble employment. We well know that if a book-keeper or clerk were engaged during five days of the week in the employ of an ordinary merchant, and on the sixth in the employ of some rich nobleman, he would be at least as faithful on the sixth day as he would on any of the five, and the probability is that he would be even more industrious on that day; but the reverse is almost the general custom in regard to the Lord's day. Even the great mass of professing Christians rise late on the Lord's day; and with the exception of spending an hour or so in the Sunday-school and listening to one or two sermons, they spend the day in idleness, looking upon it as a rest day for the body, while many use the day as a time for making a sort of review of their own personal duties during the week that has passed, or in laying plans for the coming week, none of

which are in accordance with the requirements of these prophecies.

The Mosaic law required that no beast should be compelled to labor on the Jewish Sabbath; but nothing in these prophecies indicates any such prohibition in regard to the Lord's day. Not only every beast, but every successful instrument that can be brought to do faithful service for God's kingdom, is to be used for that purpose. There is nothing said here about remaining stationary in one place, as was the case in the wilderness; but we can go in and out of the gates of Jerusalem on that day, provided we carry no worldly mental burdens. Nothing is said about a Sabbath day's journey, which it appears was permitted at a later age in the history of Judah; but we may go ten Sabbath days' journeys, or even twenty, if by so doing we can "visit the fatherless and the widow in their affliction," or aid some erring brother in an effort to keep himself "unspotted from the world," or to bring a lost soul to Christ. The prophecy is not to be understood in the typical as a prohibition to bear material burdens through the material gates of the typical Jerusalem; but in the New Covenant rest we are to "bear one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law [not of Moses, but] of Christ." On this day our pleasure is not to be in doing our "own ways," or speaking our "own words," but in delighting ourselves in the Lord.

But the bearing of burdens on the Lord's day through the gates of the antitypical Jerusalem has a deeper significance still. It means that no mental worldly burdens are to be carried into the Lord's

house on that day. It means that on the morn of that day we are to so consecrate our hearts to God by prayer, that we shall go to His house fully prepared to perform the duties which He requires of us; for we cannot do His work and carry our own baskets full of provisions too. And oh! how many burdens are carried every Lord's day through the church door into God's presence! Here is a man with a big roll under his arm. He arranged with his architect on Saturday to build him a new house, and he has brought the plan with him, and as soon as seated he unrolls it and commences making changes and improvements. He does not hear a single word of the sermon. Here comes another with a whole wheelbarrow full of troubles. And a lady, too. Her mother-in-law has slandered her, and she can think of nothing else. The minister's labor is in vain, as far as she is concerned. Several young men and young women carry heavy parcels labelled "love affairs," and the water of life flows all around them, but they catch none of it, for their vessels are already filled. A medical student has brought a patient with him, and is trying hard to study the nature of his disease, but learns nothing about the nature and cure of that terrible malady, the leprosy of sin. This man has brought his farm with him, but learns nothing about the "inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away. A judge is busy with a case—a peculiar case—and is busy in considering what decision he should render, and although having an ear on each side of his head, he hears not the text, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and

unto God the things that are God's." There are some, strange to say, who come empty-handed, and go away heavily loaded. One has a bundle of criticisms. He has caught up what he supposes to be the weak points in his minister's sermon, but he has allowed all the rest to pass by like the waters of the Jordan on their way to the Dead Sea. How truly Christ said of such, "Having ears, ye hear not." And another boasts, as he passes out of the church door, that he came to hear the gospel, but heard nothing but the minister eulogizing himself. What a bundle he carries! And how different the case would have been if he had closed his eyes to the carnal, and opened his eyes to the spiritual! The Jews saw a Samaritan with a devil, where others saw the Son of God. "Having ears, they hear not; eyes, they see not." One carries away the choir, but has left the spirit of the hymns that were sung. Another rejoices in an impression of the costumes, the hats, and ornaments; while one youth bears away an album of portraits. Only here and there one who came in "the Spirit on the Lord's day," has done the Lord's work and received the Lord's reward—an enlightened understanding and a purified conscience. These, having washed themselves at the fountain of gospel grace, are now prepared to carry the water of life to the perishing.

2d, *We are not to speak our own words.* We do not find any prohibition in the Mosaic law for restraining a man to the use of certain words on the Jewish Sabbath day. But here we find a restriction as to what language we are to use on the Lord's day.

In this, the Christian Lord's day is more strict than the Jewish Sabbath. Our language on this day is to be that of prayer and praise; or, in other words, to be employed strictly in God's service, in whatever way we can make ourselves instrumental in building up His kingdom, whether by reading and expounding His word, or by our conversation leading sinners to Christ, and making His merits and beauties known to others. As our whole time on this day belongs to the Lord, so our whole conversation should be about His business. What would we say of a clerk who should employ the whole, or even a part, of his employer's time in talking to his employer's customers about some private business of his own? Would not his employer soon begin to suspect him to be a rival, and dismiss him from his employment? The clerk's conversation with his employer's customers must be about his employer's business. In the history of Israel we read of a prince who stood by the side of the gate of Jerusalem, and whenever any one came in with any important business for his father the king, he commenced talking to them "*his own words*," instead of delighting himself with that which was to the king's interest: and we are told that "Absalom stole the hearts of the men of Israel;' and not long after this we learn that he excited the people and raised a rebellion, placing himself at the head of it, where he ignominiously lost his life.

3d, *We are to call the Lord's day a delight.* We all know the pleasure we experience when we are successful in some business enterprise. How cheering it is to shake hands with some old friend who is

engaged in some business enterprise, and hear him exclaim, in response to our inquiry in regard to his worldly success, "Oh, my business is very good now; I have all I can do." How happy he appears! Even his health appears to be benefited by his success, and no doubt his wife and children are joyful partakers of his prosperity. But on the other hand, how often do we hear, in answer to some interrogatory touching a man who looks sad and troubled, "Oh, business is so dull; times are so hard." How sad and dejected he appears! Even his health fails in consequence, and dyspepsia and nervousness seize upon him. His wife and children also bear the same haggard look. But let business revive. Let the times become easy and money plenty, and he is filled with life and contentment. Joy overspreads his countenance, and he becomes happy. Every day we have evidence of the interest men take in the success of their own affairs.

Now, if we love our friends, we cannot but be interested in their welfare. If they are successful, we rejoice with them; and if they are unfortunate, we feel that their misfortunes concern us. But suppose that we are in the employ of one of these friends—that we are engaged by him as a clerk, for instance—would we not take a much deeper interest in his success? If a clerk is honest, loves his employer, and becomes deeply interested in his employer's success in business, he will sympathize with him in his trials and participate in his joys. But suppose we find a merchant looking sad and troubled, and we inquire the cause of his affliction, and he should

answer, "Business is good, times are easy, but my men do not attend to my business; they do not care anything about it; they neglect my customers; they take no interest in my success." "Why, how is this?" we inquire. "Do you not pay them regular salaries for attending to your business?" He answers: "Yes, I pay them every week, but they have so many little private affairs of their own to attend to, and that occupy their whole attention, that they actually have no time or inclination to attend to my affairs. When a customer comes in, they at once seize upon him, and draw his attention away from the purchase of my goods to their own private affairs, and then they appear to be vexed when I suggest to them that my business is going to ruin." What would we think of such a lot of employees as these? Would we not say that they were a lot of knaves, and should be harshly dealt with? But do we not too often do the same thing when we allow our thoughts, and perhaps our conversation, to be centred on our own petty affairs on the Lord's day, and not upon the Lord's important transactions on His own day, chosen above all others to be spent in His own service? God's world is going to ruin. He has placed us here to attend to it. He has given us this day to be employed in bringing the world to a knowledge of a Saviour. He pays us for our services; and if we occupy this precious time in thinking our own thoughts, speaking our own words, and attending to our own dolls and tops and other mundane playthings, are we not robbing God just as much as

the clerk who occupies his employer's time in attending to business of his own?

4th, *We are to esteem it as a holy day.* Holy means sacred. We are to value it as a sacred day, a rich treasure—more valuable than all other days; a day to be devoted to the Lord, by reading His word, making ourselves acquainted with His law and gospel, and holding spiritual communion with Him. We know what interest a son or daughter, who is away from home, takes in the day that he is permitted to visit his father's house, and converse with his brothers and sisters, and especially with his beloved parents, about those things which are of mutual interest to both. This, to him, is a sacred day. He looks forward to it with deep interest, and longs for its coming. How much more, then, should we long for the coming of the Lord's day, a day exclusively devoted to spiritual communion with our heavenly Father, and to be occupied in His service?

5th, *We are to call it honorable.* That is, we are to honor the day; respect it as a binding obligation. Wherever you find a man who has no respect for the Lord's day, *mark that man.* Brand him as you would a thief. If that man can get his hand into your till, unknown to you, he will steal your money. We repeat, that he is already a thief, and worse than a thief. He robs God. God has placed him in this beautiful world, and given him a home, and food and clothing, and He exacts one-seventh of his time in pay, and he refuses to pay it. He is living in God's world, and refuses to pay his rent. If he will rob God, he will rob you. If he will steal God's time,

he will steal your money. Watch that man. Beware of the Sabbath-breaker. There is no crime in the decalogue that a Sabbath-breaker will not commit, if he has an opportunity and imagines that it will not be known to men. Trust no habitual Sabbath-breaker. It is an unfailing test of character. If he refuses to congregate where God's law is studied, he will most certainly trample that law under his feet. The man who will not recognize the laws of his country is a traitor, and only wants the opportunity to engage in open rebellion. The man who will not give that portion of time which God requires to the study and teaching of His laws, will most assuredly betray you if you trust him. The man who will not devote a portion of his time to the interests of God's kingdom, imperfect as the service may be, is a villain. He is destitute of all true morality. Shun him as you would the plague.

God demands one-seventh of our time,—not as a gift, but as a right; He being our landlord, and we the tenants. We owe it to God just as much as we owe to our neighbor the money we borrowed from him; and we owe it until it is paid. "Remember the Sabbath day" is a due-bill for value received, and no man who refuses to pay it can be an honest man. During the six days before, we received from our heavenly Father the manna, and our shoes and clothing are not waxen old; and now, on the Lord's day morning, God asks us to pay the bill by employing the day in His service. If any one refuses to pay, we again say, Brand him as a thief and a robber. Should any Sabbath-breaker complain that

this is harsh language, we answer him, Pay your honest debts, and then we will recognize you as an honest man. You owe God one-seventh of all your time; pay it by hallowing this day.

6th, Then, in these prophecies, we find rich promises to all those who hallow the Lord's day. "*Thou shalt delight thyself in the Lord.*" See that miserable, cowardly, sneaking debtor, who will not pay his honest debts, as he hides around the corner to avoid meeting his creditor in the street. He takes no delight in his creditor. How can he? His creditor's presence is odious to him. His own conscience convicts him of robbery. We cannot delight ourselves in the Lord, if we rob Him of that which is His just due. But the man who pays his debts can face his creditor with a smile and enjoy his company; and just so, the man who promptly pays to God what he owes Him, can rejoice in the Lord his God with a clean conscience and a pure heart. Pay the Lord what thou owest Him, and then thou shalt delight thyself in Him. This is what is meant when the Scriptures say, "The pure in heart shall see God."

Then the Lord's promise comes to him who fulfils this obligation. "I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father." He that has been faithful over a few things shall be made ruler over many things. Our time on earth is but a state of probation to test our character as to the destinies of eternity. If we are honest before God, and pay Him all our just dues, then He will take us into His employment in that world of which Christ's Sabbath

of rest here on earth is but a foretaste. The "heritage of Jacob" includes all the blessings of the New Covenant. This is to be our food for ever, even the fulness of God in Christ.

The Lord's Day a Day of Intense Activity.

The Lord's day is not a day to be spent in idleness and sloth. Some people imagine that if they abstain from all manual labor on this day, they have complied with all that the day demands. They sleep a part of the day, and a part of it they occupy in telling idle tales or reading works of fiction, and the result is that the day is completely squandered, and no good results from it.

The Lord's day was given by Christ to the world, and is intimately connected with the world's redemption. It is not a day of idleness, but a day of work, of busy, active life. It is the symbol of the dawning of a new era in the history of our race. The old Jewish Sabbath was but a shadow of the Lord's day, and was given by Moses to the Jews, and not to the world. It was a day that God hallowed in remembrance of the creation of the world, and was given to the Jews as a rest from bondage, and was but a carnal rest, the last day of which the carnal nature of Christ rested in the grave. The dawn of the resurrection morning was a new era in the history of our world. When Christ was laid in the grave, the redemption of the world was complete, as far as Christ's atonement was concerned; but now the world was to be saved by the preaching of that atonement. The foundation had been laid, and now

the building was to be erected. When God laid the foundations of the earth "the morning stars sang together;" and is it reasonable to suppose that they were silent when Christ laid the foundation for man's redemption? Oh! that first Lord's day was a busy day, both in heaven and upon earth! It was certainly a busy day among the angels, nor was it a less busy day among the disciples. Christ's friends did not by any means spend that day on which He arose from the dead in idleness. We read that certain women came "early in the morning," "as it began to dawn;" and then they were commanded to "go *quickly*" and tell the disciples that He was risen from the dead. "And they departed *quickly* from the sepulchre;" and Peter came *running*. And then we read of two of them who went into the country, where they meet with their risen Lord, and that same night they return to inform the other disciples. From early dawn till late that night we find them busy. Most assuredly that was not an idle day to the disciples, whatever it may have been to others.

Nor was the day of Pentecost one of less activity. Peter preached a thrilling sermon on that day, that resulted in the conversion of three thousand persons. This was no mean day's work; and if there is any truth in the views of our Baptist friends, that these converts on that day received an immersion of their bodies in water at the hands of the disciples, we may rest assured that those disciples were excessively tired when night came. That was anything but a Jewish Sabbath to them.

The Lord's day is not a day of bodily rest. A world is to be saved by the preaching of the gospel, and God has appointed this day as the day on which it is to be done, and it is not going to be done by *resting* on this day. The word Sabbath applied to this day is a misnomer. It is a day of work—hard work, and of intense activity. If every professing Christian would work as hard on the Lord's day for God's kingdom as he does on other days for himself, within ten years the world would be turned upside down. It is a grievous error into which many Christians have fallen, of supposing that they keep the day holy when they spend it in idleness. There is work—a world of work—to be done on this day, and not an hour of it can be lost without committing sin. We repeat, that it is not *a Sabbath* in the sense of bodily rest. The apostles never called it by that name. They ever designated it as the "Lord's day," or the "first day of the week," either of which indicates the very reverse of the Jewish Sabbath. It is not a Jewish Sabbath, but a Lord's day of busy, active work. The early Christians did not call it *the Sabbath*. It is a modern error that has given the name to a day just the reverse of what the etymology of the word means. We do not approve of changing the name given to the day by the apostles to one belonging to another day pertaining to the system of Moses. If any change is made, let it be one that is appropriate, introduced by usage, and not by a false taste.

"SUNDAY" AN APPROPRIATE NAME FOR THE LORD'S DAY.

We observe that many good men, especially ministers of the gospel and officers of churches, are careful to call the Lord's day "the Sabbath." Ask them why they do so, and they will answer you that the name *Lord's day* is more appropriate, but less convenient, and but little used; that *Sunday* is a pagan name, the day formerly being dedicated by heathen nations to the worship of the sun, and consequently to call the day *Sunday* favors pagan idolatry.

This reasoning would be valid did we still consider the day as consecrated to the sun; but Paul's reasoning in regard to consecrated meats (Rom. xiv.; 1 Cor. viii.) utterly annihilates this argument. Meat consecrated to an idol may be eaten by a Christian with perfect impunity, if eaten to satisfy hunger, and not to worship the idol; unless some weak brother (and alas! how many weak brothers there are, who persist in being weak and puny, rather than drink deep of the gospel medicine!) should through his ignorance be caused to stumble.

Sunday, we say, is a proper name. We care nothing about the origin of the word. It may have been pagan before it was baptized by Christian usage. Cornelius was a pagan, yet when he was baptized a Christian, no one ever thought of changing his name. The changing of names in religious rites is a practice of the Roman Catholic Church, and is practised on all ecclesiastics, from Pope Leo XIII. down to Fra Benito and Sister Agnes, who

sweep the floor and whip the dogs out of the most humble convent. Why, then, should we ape the Romish Church in this? We honor no idol by eating consecrated meat when we are hungry, and we do no dishonor by calling the Lord's day *Sunday*, unless we entertain in our minds the pagan superstition of consecrating the day to the worship of the sun-god.

The Jewish Sabbath was in memory of a night—of the hours consecrated to rest. The period to which it most appropriately belongs is that period commencing with the night on which the paschal lamb was slain in Egypt, and it ended with the rising sun on the morning of our Saviour's resurrection. The Christian Sunday begins with the rising sun—most appropriate symbol of light. It commenced on the morning when the "Sun of Righteousness" arose from the grave, and, scattering the dark shadows of the long Jewish night, ascended triumphant in the full splendor of the New Covenant, to give light, not only to the Jew, but to all who sit in heathen darkness. Sunday, then, is a proper name to designate a day whose refulgent light already encircles the globe, and before whose dissolving beams the ruins of Judaism and Paganism are fast crumbling back to dust.

Sunday, a day whose *morning light* found in the sepulchre of a risen Saviour nothing but His grave clothes, appropriate symbols of all carnal shadows, to be for ever buried in the grave of the Old Covenant, while the kingdom of light, illumined by the celestial Sun, fears no night and no grave.

Sunday, a day whose *noonday splendors* cheer the pilgrim in his onward march towards the celestial world, undimmed by any cloud of sin, unwearied by any labor in the Lord's service, as he presses forward "toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus."

Sunday, a day whose *evening shadows* entrance the believer's eye as he beholds the golden towers and battlements and pearly gates of the New Jerusalem, all aglow with the refulgent splendors of the Sun of Righteousness. May we all spend an eternity in His light!

Sunday, a day of active Christian effort here, whose evening glories will fade into the eternal day when all the people of God shall be gathered home to enjoy the blessings of His kingdom for ever. "And in the city of the living God we shall behold, with the eyes of the immortal nature, the light which beams forth from the eternal throne." "And the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it; for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof. And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it." "And there shall be no night there; and they need no candle, neither light of the sun; for the Lord God giveth them light; and they shall reign for ever and ever."

Review and Conclusion.

The foregoing article was prepared for publication over four years ago (being intended as part of a larger work), and has been given to the Review

with but few unimportant changes. Of all the works on this subject, defending the views here opposed, that which appears to contain the most solid reasoning is by Prof. Fairbairn, of Glasgow. (*Fairbairn's "Typology,"* Vol. II., Sec. 3.) But the defects of his system are so evident that a few quotations will serve to show, we think, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that the plan we have presented is the right one.

Dr. Fairbairn maintains that a seventh day of rest was given to the world at the creation, and that it was "engrafted" into the Jewish system, which gave it a "symbolical and typical value," and that from thence "the original ordinance" was *transferred* to the Christian system, with a new day and a new name, and yet he contends for "a strict and literal obligation of the Fourth Commandment."

We have nowhere maintained that God gave the world no weekly rest until He gave the manna to the Israelites in the desert. We have admitted that, from inference, we understand that God's preachers of righteousness did teach the people to observe a weekly rest. We think there can be no doubt about this, and we should consider it a great error to say that the antediluvian world had no seventh day rest. We can form no idea of the vast amount of knowledge that some of these preachers may have possessed, when we consider that father and son associated with each other through a period of several hundred years, and imparted their wisdom and knowledge to each other; while the Angel of the Covenant walked with them as their Teacher and Guide, instructing them in divine truths, much as He did

with His disciples at a later period on the hills of Galilee. To preach righteousness was to preach the moral law, and that law includes the Fourth Commandment—the dedication of one-seventh of our time to God's service. But what we contend for is that the JEWISH TYPE was *not* given to the world. The Jewish type was given to the Jew, and to the Jew only, with the exception of the proselyte or stranger within his gate. It was never given to the Gentile world. Dr. Fairbairn says of the Sabbath: "Having been engrafted into a religion so purely symbolical as the Mosaic, it was unavoidable that the bodily rest enjoined in it should acquire, like all the other outward things belonging to the religion, a symbolical and typical value." (*Typology*, Vol. II., p. 126.) Until this engrafting process was accomplished, it was neither type nor symbol to any Gentile nation. Dr. Fairbairn also confirms this when he admits (p. 129), "so little depended upon the exact day, that on the occasion of renewing the Sabbatical institution in the wilderness, the Lord seems to have made the weekly series run from the first giving of the manna. His example, therefore, in the work of creation, was intended merely to fix the relative proportion between the days of ordinary labor and those of sacred rest, and with that view is appealed to in the law." In this we believe Dr. Fairbairn to be right. We certainly can obtain no inference from Genesis ii. 3, that bears the faintest shadow of a command. The only inference we derive from this passage is, that God blessed and sanctified the seventh period of creation by making it the period in which the great

drama of man's earthly career was to be enacted—his fall and redemption; otherwise it would have been stated as it was of the other six days: "the evening and the morning" were the seventh day; but the "evening" was yet to come in the Old Testament dispensation, and the "morning" of the New Covenant was far away in the distance of future ages. Nor is the seventh day anywhere called a Sabbath until the Jewish type was given to the Israelites. Until a written law was given, God's commands were taught by word of mouth, by men whom He called for this purpose, as He did Abraham. The patriarchal age was probably to some extent typical of that work which is now in progress in missionary fields, where Christian ministers (preachers of righteousness) are busily engaged in instructing unlettered men by word of mouth—imparting an imperfect knowledge of that law which their children will be able at some future time to read for themselves. Those who have labored as missionaries in the foreign field can understand this perfectly well.

In regard to Col. ii. 16, Dr. Fairbairn presents precisely the same view that we have given, which is undoubtedly the correct one. He says: "The apostle discharges Christians from the observance of Sabbath days, not in a false and improper sense, but in that very sense in which they were shadows of good things to come, placing them on a footing, in this respect, with distinctions of meat and drink. It is needless to say here that certain feast days of the Jews, being withdrawn from a common to a sacred use, were called Sabbaths, and that the apostle alludes

exclusively to these. There can be no doubt, indeed, that they were so called, and are also included here, but not to the exclusion of the seventh-day Sabbath, which, from the very nature of the case, was the one most likely to be thought of by the Colossians. Unless it had been expressly excepted, we must in fairness suppose it to have been at least equally intended with the others." (*Typology*, Vol. II., p. 125.) Can anything be plainer than this? The Jewish Sabbath was abolished, and could by no manner of means be *transferred* to the Christian system. Again, Dr. Fairbairn says: "When another state of things was introduced, it became necessary to assign to such Sabbath—the Jewish seventh day of rest—a place among the things that were done away, and so far to change the ordinance itself as to transfer it to a different day, and even call it by a new name. But as baptism in the Spirit is Christ's circumcision, so the Lord's day is His Sabbath; and to be in the Spirit on that day, worshipping and serving Him in the truth of His gospel, is to take up the yoke of the Fourth Commandment." (*Typology*, p. 127.) Here, in a nut-shell, we have precisely the ground we advocate. The Jewish Sabbath is abolished. The "ordinance itself" becomes a new day—the Christian Lord's day. No one will for a moment pretend to say that Christ's circumcision by the Spirit is a transfer of Jewish carnal circumcision into the New Covenant system. Then why contend that the Lord's day is a transfer of the Jewish Sabbath? There is no transfer about it. The one is a type of the other, and as such cannot be *transferred*. And yet Dr.

Fairbairn maintains that the Fourth Commandment is to be observed literally. Why, we doubt very much if the good Doctor ever observed it literally himself—keeping Saturday instead of Sunday. The Fourth Commandment is no more to be understood literally than is the preface to the Ten Commandments, or the promise affixed to the Fifth, to be understood literally. "I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt," is applicable to every baptized child whom God has chosen from the bondage of the great heathen world (the true Egypt), by giving him his birth in a Christian land, of Christian parents, and with Christian privileges, in accordance with the covenant made with Abraham, that He would bless the infants of his spiritual seed. This is an election by birthright which no man can deny, and yet not the election to eternal life in Christ from before the foundation of the world. "That thy days may be long in the land (Canaan) which the Lord thy God giveth thee," does not mean that every child who is obedient to his Christian parents shall be entitled to a homestead in modern Palestine, but that he shall be entitled to a long life of blessing and usefulness in the Christian Church, comparatively free from the vices and temptations to which his neighbors' children are continually exposed, hastening them on to an untimely grave.

Those who contend that the Fourth Commandment was literally given to the world from the beginning, would do well to stop and think a moment. If the Fourth Commandment, as it stands in the Deca-

logue, was literally given to the world, then the preface to the Ten Commandments was given literally also. Now, we know of no sense in which it can be said that God brought every child of Adam born into the world out of Egypt before he had learned the first table of the law, or even the First Commandment, unless the atonement of Christ was universal—that is, that Christ made atonement for Adam's sin for the whole race. Now this is a measure of New School doctrine which none of our Old School friends are going to accept. Nor is it literally true. Pharaoh and his hosts were not "brought up out of Egypt." The Canaanites destroyed by Joshua were never "brought up out of Egypt." The facts of the case are, that God brought His Church out of Egypt, including their infant children. Christ died for His Church, including the children of believers. The latter are redeemed from Egypt, or the pagan world, by birthright, inheriting the promises made to the fathers. If we are wrong on this point, we would thank any one who would put us right.

The Lord's day is a new day, in memory of Christ's resurrection; a day in which we are not to worship God by carnal ceremonies, but in spirit and in truth. The state can only enforce the outward observance of the Ten Commandments, but the gospel requires of its adherents their spiritual observance as well. The Jews observe the day in which Christ lay in the tomb, and rightly, too, as they reject the Saviour. We observe the day He arose. The Jewish system enjoined not only rest of the body on the Sabbath,

but also strict meditation in the law—a state of discipleship; but the Christian system requires the teaching of the gospel—a state of apostleship. Herein consists the great difference between the two days; hence the Christian Church cannot be too strict in the observance of the Lord's day, "spending the whole time in the public and private exercises of God's worship, except so much as is to be taken up in works of necessity and mercy." We repeat, then, that we cannot be too strict in its observance. It is better for us to err on the right side, if we err at all, doing too much than too little; and when our summons comes to call us into the next period of rest—the rest in the New Jerusalem—may we hear with it the welcome reception, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

PART SECOND.

THE PHARISEE AND THE PUBLICAN.

CHRIST'S SERMON ON THE SECOND TABLE OF THE LAW, OR MAN'S DUTY TO MAN.

THAT portion of Scripture commencing with Luke xv. 1, and ending with Luke xvii. 10, is one continuous discourse or sermon, divided, it is true, into various heads, but each head so related to the others as to form a link in one continuous chain, varied only as the Great Preacher directs His voice to the whole audience about matters which concern all in general, or to His disciples about some point in which they are more especially interested. The three parables contained in the fifteenth chapter, usually denominated the *Parables of Grace*, ought by no means to be separated from the remainder of the discourse, as is usually done by theologians; but the whole should be studied in their connection, and when once thoroughly comprehended, will be found to contain a far more admirable and complete system of Christian theology than any yet constructed by the councils of men.

THE PREFACE.

"Then drew near unto Him all the publicans and sinners for to hear Him. And the Pharisees and scribes murmured, saying, This man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them."—LUKE xv. 1, 2.

HERE we have the occasion of the discourse---the murmuring of the Pharisees because our Lord received sinners, and ate with them. In order, then, that we may understand and appreciate the whole discourse, we must not consider our Lord in the light of a modern evangelist, preaching to a mixed multitude in some modern city, among the members of whose audience some petty jealousy had arisen, but as preaching to a specified company of typical characters, and yet each character the representative of a class existing through all time. Let us, then, carefully examine the characteristics of the audience which forms Christ's congregation on this occasion.

Among the most prominent of this audience are the publicans, or, as the word indicates, the *public men*—those who gathered the taxes and revenues for the Roman government. They gathered the taxes on private property and real estate, as well as tribute on foreign goods, and might well be denominated the *tax gatherers*. If I understand the matter correctly, at the time of this occurrence the Jewish nation was subject to two taxes: 1st, That paid to the temple service for the support of the Levitical priesthood, including home rule and the expenses of the temple, amounting to one-tenth of their income; and 2d, A tax to the Roman government, a part of which was

expended in maintaining a foreign government in their midst, and a part of which was sent away to maintain the general government at Rome. This also amounted to one-tenth of their income. So that virtually they had to pay one-fifth of their income for taxes—a very heavy burden indeed.

The Pharisees despised and hated the publicans, because they looked upon them as traitors, who, by collecting the taxes for a foreign power, had virtually sold their brethren into what they considered to be a species of bondage. The Pharisees considered themselves as the chosen people—"the children of the kingdom,"—while they looked upon all Gentiles as only so many dogs, who, instead of ruling over them, should have been their slaves, compelled to kneel and cringe at their feet, as a dog does at the feet of his master; and they were now daily expecting this change of positions by the coming of the promised Messiah, who would subdue all nations to Himself. But the publicans had not only committed what appeared to them a terrible outrage against the nation, by selling themselves as servants to the Gentile dogs, but their occupation was polluting by bringing them in continual contact with the Gentiles, for they had daily and hourly to handle their money—Roman coin, on one side of which was a portrait of Cæsar, the personification of the Roman gods, and on the other side an emblem, the Roman eagle, symbol of the constant watchfulness and faithfulness with which Rome guarded her interests, as well as the velocity and severity with which she punished any infraction of them.

The reasons for which the publicans had accepted the offices of trust under the Roman government were doubtless varied. Poverty may have driven some to accept an occupation which their souls detested; the love of gain may have actuated others; while a still larger class, having an indistinct idea of the disintegration of the ceremonial law and the nature of the Messianic kingdom, doubtless considered ceremonial purity of less consequence than that purity and integrity of heart which actuated them to so readily accept our Saviour and His mission. Whatever the objects may have been with which these persons accepted the position, they were considered invalid by the Pharisees and scribes, who had ejected them from the temple and tabernacle service, and branded them as outcasts from the nation.

Intimately allied with the publicans were the *sinners*, or persons who, either from choice or bodily defect, did not conform to the ceremonial law. The Pharisees considered all bodily disease as the result of gross sin, hence, a man who was born blind was a sinner (John ix. 34), and if not pronounced clean by priestly authority, although he may have been healed by a supernatural power, was still considered unworthy of a place among "the children of the kingdom." The injustice of such conduct, doubtless would lead many such to seek a purity and holiness superior to the ceremonial, and thus pave the way for the affection bestowed upon our Lord by those whom the Pharisees considered as lost. These two classes—possibly including a few Samaritans—were the "Lost sheep of the house of Israel," to

whom our Lord expressly declares Himself to have been sent.

The other important element which formed this congregation was the Pharisees. The word "Pharisee" means *a separatist*—one separated from the world—purer and holier than others. The Pharisees were the righteous people of the nation. They were very strict in the observance of the Mosaic law, very careful to keep all the requirements of the ceremonial law, and especially to guard themselves against all ceremonial impurity. If a Pharisee came in contact with a Gentile, whose whole body and clothing were polluted by the swine's flesh, and other unclean food that he had eaten, he naturally felt himself polluted, and must pass through a ceremonial purification before he would dare enter the temple or tabernacle. The same reasons would keep him aloof from the publican and sinner. He could not associate with him; could not eat out of the same vessel. The rich man would no sooner allow the poor Lazarus, who was laid at his gate, to touch him, than he would allow the dogs to lick his hands or feet. To a Pharisee, the deepest and most deplorable depth of Lazarus's degradation, was not alone his poverty, but the pollution caused by his body being covered with sores, and these sores to be licked by unclean dogs, thus mingling their saliva with his blood, and corrupting his whole system.

The scribes were intimately allied to the Pharisees. Their occupation was to prepare copies of the Old Testament Scriptures, for private and general use. As they were supposed to employ their whole

time in copying portions of the sacred writings, it was generally understood that they were thoroughly conversant with those writings. But they, like the Pharisees, had caught at the shadow and lost the spirit. They had failed to see in the Mosaic symbolism a hand pointing them away from self to the true Physician; and supposing man to be his own saviour, they had made themselves, in the strictest sense of the word, *servants of the law.* To them, there was, virtually, in the whole Mosaic system, no cure for sin but to live aloof from it. In Gilead there was no balm and no physician. The whole Old Covenant was to them one mighty system of quarantine. The holiness which it required was to keep away from pollution, and not to come in contact with it. "Touch not, taste not, handle not," was the Alpha and Omega of the law. The only remedy for moral disease, of which ceremonial impurity was a symbol, was to keep away from it. There was no physician that could cure. All that the priest could do was to offer sacrifice, look upon the leper, and pronounce him unclean, or if cured by the miraculous intervention of Divine power, to pronounce him clean. He had no power to cleanse the disease.

We now have the audience to which Christ presented the following parables: The publicans and sinners on the one hand, forming "the lost sheep of the house of Israel," and the Pharisees and the scribes on the other, forming the "children of the kingdom," who had never gone astray. The two combined were the representatives of the visible

kingdom of Israel. They were all the carnal seed of Abraham,—all born within the limits of the visible kingdom, and a portion alone had strayed away from it. Now, we must not, on the one hand, confound this visible kingdom with the spiritual, nor, on the other, with the Gentile world, from which it was entirely separate; and yet it is typical of that preliminary process at work to-day in the minds of believers and students of God's word which in the end establishes the spiritual kingdom.

It does not appear that the Pharisees objected to John the Baptist preaching to the out-casts of Israel. On the other hand, they would admire his austere life, his fastings, his baptism of running water—symbol of purity; but they would doubtless object to his retirement and desert life, and would much rather have had him make a public exhibition of his austerity by a show of long fastings in the temple, or in some noted synagogue. But now the Great Physician has come—He who has control over all diseases. He has no need to remain away from the unclean; He can eat with them, and suffer no bodily defilement; He can put His hands upon the polluted leper and cleanse him, without any fear of being defiled Himself.

All this was a mystery to the Pharisees and scribes. They could not understand it. They had supposed that, above all others, the Messiah, the Son of David, would be a most strict example of ceremonial purity. That He should allow Himself to be defiled by coming in contact with publicans and sinners, and eating with them, was, to their minds, only a proof of His

own impurity and unholiness. He was not the Saviour they had expected; one who would save them from Gentile power, and consequently from Gentile pollution. He told them, however, plainly, that "they that are whole need not a physician," and that He came "not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." Yet they could not understand Him, and "murmured that He should receive sinners, and eat with them." It is in reference to this that He relates the three following parables.

THE LOST SHEEP.

"And He spake this parable unto them, saying, What man of you having a hundred sheep, if he lose one of them, doth not leave the ninety and nine in the wilderness, and go after that which is lost, until he find it? And when he hath found it, he layeth it on his shoulders, rejoicing. And when he cometh home, he calleth together his friends and neighbors, saying unto them, Rejoice with me; for I have found my sheep which was lost. I say unto you, that likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons which need no repentance."—Luke xv. 3–7.

In order that we may better understand these parables, it will be necessary to look upon them, not from our stand-point of view in these later ages, and with our surroundings, but as a good pious Jew of Christ's time would understand them, with his surroundings, and the knowledge which he possessed of the history of his own people, with their customs and practices. It will also be necessary to note some things in common to all, and some points in which

there is a wide difference. Treating of the same subject as they do, they go hand in hand, and should by no means be studied separately; only by being viewed in their relation to each other can their beauties be properly observed. The three, as they are arranged by the evangelist, appear to manifest types of three grades of intelligence, as well as of condition.

It will be observed that the stray sheep did not find itself, nor return of its own free will. The shepherd went after it, and searched till he had found it; and then he carried it back upon his own shoulders.

The lost piece of money did not find itself, but the woman swept the floor, and searched diligently with a lighted candle, till she found it.

Not so with the prodigal son. There was no searching for him. His father remained at home until he returned. He came back of his own accord.

Again, notice the proportion of numbers. One sheep out of a hundred; one piece of money out of ten; one son out of two.

Again, observe that one sheep out of a hundred owned by one shepherd is but a small loss; one piece of money out of ten is a much greater loss to a poor woman. But one son out of two, on whom the wealth of a tender father's loving heart had been bestowed, was a loss far exceeding either of the others.

Again, the first parable treats of a silly sheep, ignorant of what it was doing. The guilt is but little, and can only excite the shepherd's pity—not his anger. The second is a coin bearing the image and

superscription of the king. This coin is lost and searched after and found among the kitchen filth,—there is greater guilt here, but it rests upon the woman who lost it. But the third is a greater crime still. The son wilfully sins against light; leaves a father's house, where every care and attention had been paid to him; goes away from a home of purity and holiness, and becomes the companion of harlots and filthy swine.

Once more, in the case of the sheep, the shepherd lays it on his shoulder and carries it, not to where the ninety and nine are, in the wilderness (or still under the law), but to his own home. The piece of money is restored to its former position. But the father tells the brother of the prodigal, "All I have is thine." There is no record that the lost income was ever restored to the wandering son; and yet the gifts bestowed upon him would indicate that something still better than the income was reserved for him in the future. These different grades doubtless refer to different attainments in the knowledge of God's kingdom.

The parable of the lost sheep was very appropriately addressed to the Pharisees and scribes, who professed to be the spiritual shepherds of Israel, those who should have taken care of the flock, and brought back the wandering ones, instead of murmuring and complaining because another was doing it for them. In many cases they had scattered the flock instead of gathering them; and it is quite probable that even in the present instance their harsh, cruel treatment of the publicans had been the cause of driving

them away from the tabernacle. Ezekiel says, in reference to such, "Woe be to the shepherds of Israel that do feed themselves. Should not the shepherds feed the flocks? Ye eat the fat, and ye clothe you with the wool. Ye kill them that are fed; but ye feed not the flock. The diseased have ye not strengthened, neither have ye healed that which was sick, neither have ye bound up that which was broken, neither have ye brought again that which was driven away, neither have ye sought that which was lost; but with force and with cruelty have ye ruled them." (Ezek. xxxiv. 2–19.) Zechariah also says: "Woe to the *idol* shepherd that leaveth the flock! the sword shall be upon his arm and upon his right eye; his arm shall be clean dried up, and his right eye shall be utterly darkened." (Zec. xi. 15–17.) (The word "*idol*," in this sentence, means one extremely selfish, who takes all the worship, honor, and glory to himself, without yielding anything in return, just as an idol would.

It is needless to recount here how often our Lord is called in the Scriptures the Shepherd of Israel, and how often we are told "He leadeth His flock like a shepherd, and gathereth the little ones in His arms." This language is perfectly familiar to all who have studied the Bible.

The prodigal, when he had wandered away, could return to his father's home; but not so with this sheep. It required a powerful arm to bring Israel, like a flock, from the darkness and bondage of Egypt. (Psa. lxxvii. 20; Psa. lxxviii. 52.) And here it may be well to observe, that in the history of God's

Church there were three wanderings recorded, of which that in Egypt was the first; the second, in Babylon (in which, not like Israel in Egypt, they bore the king's seal, having already been under the law and the prophets); and the third, when they were carried away captive by the Romans. From the latter they must return themselves. God will not send a Moses to gather and bring them back, as He did in former times. They may wander twenty, or even forty centuries; they must in the end come back of their own free will; but God will not restore to them the lost heritage of Palestine, but make them partakers with the Gentiles.

The ninety and nine were left in the wilderness; not an open, barren desert, or a haunt of wild beasts, but a land of green pastures. According to the oriental idea, any land out on the common, and not enclosed in a cultivated field, would be called a desert. One Spanish version, which I have, calls it the *despoblado*, literally "*the unpeopled;*" that is, not covered with houses and farms. We read in the record of the miracle of the five loaves and two fishes, in the sixth chapter of John, that there was much grass in the place, while another evangelist calls it *a desert.* Any large tract of uncultivated green pasture-land would be, in this sense, a desert.

Christ, the great Shepherd, came to our world "to seek and to save that which was lost." For this purpose He clothed Himself in our humanity, followed us down into the very Egypt of our degradation, and by His cross and His grave He plunged Himself into the very Red Sea of the enemy's

battle-ground, and received all the fiery darts of the enemy into His own bosom. He found us in the very jaws of the monster death, and having rescued us, He carries us in triumph to his own celestial home.

And now He calls His friends and neighbors together to rejoice with Him. They may be the members of the sanctified Church, or they may be saints and angels in heaven. The "*shall be*" joy (vs. 7) has led many to suppose that it would be future, when all the redeemed should be gathered in His celestial kingdom; but then it is represented as taking place while the sinner is repenting; so that I am rather inclined to suppose that carrying him home merely means making a son of him, by bringing him into membership in the sanctified Church on earth.

But who are the ninety and nine *just persons* who need no repentance? Are these, as many commentators assert, Pharisees who are just in their own eyes, merely imagining themselves just?—whited sepulchres, clean without, but full of filth within? I must say that I cannot, for one moment, accept such a superficial view as this. The ninety and nine have not wandered away. The nine pieces of money have not been lost. The prodigal's brother never left his father's home.

If we take the proper view of the case, the solution is an easy one. The sheep had wandered away from the *fold in the* DESERT, not from the shepherd's home. The publicans and sinners had wandered away from the visible kingdom of Israel. The

Pharisees had not wandered from this kingdom, but had complied with all the requirements of the ceremonial law. They had no need of repentance (the word repentance means a change of mind, a coming back), having never gone astray. Christ's spiritual kingdom is not taken into consideration here. The ninety and nine were legally righteous, and, as such, were at home in the kingdom of Israel, never having wandered from it. When the kingdom of God—the kingdom of faith—is established, then another and a higher righteousness is required, and to this the wanderer is carried when brought back, and is now made a son of God through the gospel, while the ninety and nine still remain in the desert, servants of the law. Over *this one* there is more rejoicing than over the ninety and nine that went not astray. The youngest, weakest, tenderest child of the Father is greater than the greatest of all the prophets of the old or legal dispensation, for they are but servants, while he is a son.

"*I say unto you*," says the author of this parable. He whose eye penetrates all worlds alone can tell us of the rejoicings in heaven over the rescue of the penitent sinner from death and hell.

And now, let us seek the lesson to be learned. Christ, in this parable, appeals to their pity and compassion. The Pharisees professed to be the spiritual leaders of Israel, and doubtless many of them were material shepherds as well. He makes no reference to the reasons which, in the first place, had caused this sheep to wander, but merely states that it was lost.

Not one of the Pharisees but would, under the

circumstances, have started at once in pursuit of the wanderer. If such is the case, why do they object to bringing back a wanderer to the fold who is of the seed of Abraham—a brother having an immortal soul? But Pharisees are as abundant in the Christian Church to-day as they were in Israel in our Saviour's time. They may not murmur at a wanderer being brought back, but they will not receive him as a brother. He has fallen into disgrace; his character is stained with past sins, which they cannot forget; he has a hard struggle to maintain himself and family; he has been, and may still be, afflicted with disease, and the vices of his early life have left him in poverty; his education has been neglected; he is ignorant and eccentric, uncouth, a rustic, and although he may be welcome to a seat in the church, it must be a back seat. All such Christians are still under the legal righteousness of the law, and have not yet attained to that Christ-like, child-like simplicity which loves our neighbor as we do ourselves.

THE LOST PIECE OF MONEY.

"Either what woman, having ten pieces of silver, if she lose one piece, doth not light a candle, and sweep the house, and seek diligently till she find it? And when she hath found it, she calleth her friends and her neighbors together, saying, Rejoice with me; for I have found the piece which I had lost. Likewise, I say unto you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth."—Luke xv. 8–10.

We must not take such a superficial view of our Lord's teaching as to suppose that the parable of the lost piece of money is but a repetition of the

parable of the lost sheep—meaning the same thing, only expressed in different words. These parables are connected together like links in a golden chain; yet each one is as different from that which preceded it as it is from that which follows. In the parable of the lost sheep an appeal is made to their own individual responsibility as shepherds over the flock, leaving their own conscience to accuse them, and at the same time recognize in Christ, if they will, the Good Shepherd, who came to seek and to save that which was lost; but in this parable a woman—feminine, not masculine, gender—represents an ecclesiastical body—the synagogue, or in other words, the Jewish church. The seeking power in this parable is apparently more the Spirit's influence through a combined human instrumentality, rather than the Shepherd's exposing His own life for the salvation of the lost. Moses was sent by God to bring Israel from their wanderings in Egypt, but in their return from Babylon He raised up for them four prominent leaders—Ezra, Nehemiah, Joshua, and Zerubbabel. The desire of Israel in Egypt was to escape from cruel bondage. His desire in Babylon was to be restored to his own country and government.

As money usually bears the image of the king or emperor of the country in which it is coined, so a piece of money in this parable has been understood by all expositors, both ancient and modern, to represent the human soul; bearing the image of the great King, according to the express declaration of the Scriptures, "God created man in His own image." I am, however, inclined to think that the

image of the King, on one side, was the impressions made by the teachings and example of the kings and prophets of Israel—representatives of Christ's kingly and prophetic character; and the inscription on the other side, the impression of the law—the mint of the great King. Israel, in Babylon, never ceased to mourn their lost condition. Their hearts were ever filled with longings to return to Jerusalem, the city in which they had been stamped and coined, but no such desire was manifested in Egypt. There they only bemoaned their lost condition, but manifested no desire to return to the land of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob.

The woman having lost a piece of silver, "lights a candle." The candle is God's word, shining through human agency, according to Christ's own words: "Ye are the light of the world. A city that is set on a hill cannot be hid. Neither do men light a candle and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick, and it giveth light to all that are in the house. Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven." With the same object in view, Paul says: "That ye may be blameless and harmless, the sons of God, without rebuke, in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation, among whom ye shine as lights in the world, *holding forth the word of life.*" And again: "All things that are reproved are made manifest by the light; for whatsoever doth make manifest is light." "My Word is a lamp unto thy feet," etc. Perhaps, to be more definite, we may say that the candle in the Old Testament dispensation is the

word as given by Moses and the prophets. "The testimony of Jesus is the Spirit of prophecy."

The Church holds forth the candle of God's word in her ministry, preaching the word in a general sense; but there must be something more than a general preaching of the word. A knowledge of God alone is not sufficient to save the soul. A knowledge of the word will save no man. If we turn for a moment to the opening of the seven seals, in the book of Revelation, we will observe that the first scene presented is that of a rider on a white horse, wearing a garland on his head—a crown symbolical of delegated authority, and not the diadem of the king. This rider had a *bow* in his hand—a symbol of conviction. "Thine arrows are sharp in the heart of the king's enemies." This is followed by a red horse, with a rider to whom was given a *sharp sword*, bringing conviction home to the soul, and producing repentance. This sharp sword is the candle of this parable. At the opening of the third seal, a rider on a black horse is seen, with a *pair of balances in his hand.* Black is a symbol of prophecy, and the balances a symbol of justice—honest dealing between man and man; a system of just weights and measures; a measure of wheat and three measures of barley for their just value, and no adulteration of the oil and the wine. The balances of the third seal are the *broom* of this parable. I cannot say here, as some do, that the broom represents the gospel, because the gospel in its plenitude was not yet given. The outline of the gospel, as contained in Old Testament prophecy, is

to be sought for in the lighted candle. John, the greatest of all the prophets of the old dispensation, was "a burning and a shining light." The candle illumines; the broom cleans out the rubbish. Both go hand in hand. The broom is Joshua's sword, cleaning out the Canaanites. The broom does not appear to be so much the general teaching of the word, as to be the cleansing out of the rubbish from the Church, while the gospel would rather indicate a cleansing or washing of the coin itself after it has been found. The candle would indicate a general illumination of the word, while the broom indicates the word put in practice. Moses was a schoolmaster, Israel the discipleship, and the school-room the desert. Joshua on the battle-field enforced what Moses had taught. A red horse, symbol of war, is an appropriate symbol of the law; so also is a broom, overturning everything, disarranging the furniture, driving out the cats and dogs, and creating a tremendous dust. Oh! what a dust the law arouses in the heart of the sinner! False doctrine, in the allegorical language of the Scriptures, is compared to a *smoke;* and we ever observe that where an attempt is made to enforce the law, Satan attempts to obscure it by covering it with a smoke or dust of false doctrine. But the broom continues its work. Every nook and corner is swept. Dirt, filth, old rags, rotten clothing, decaying fruit and vegetables, roll away before the broom. Oh! who would have thought that such a mass of rottenness and filth could have accumulated in the human heart as is revealed by the light of the Word and the enforcement

of justice! Oh! is it strange that when the churches and ministers come with their weapons, that those who are at ease should complain that "those who turn the world upside down are come hither also"?

An old, wicked king is routed out of his corner, where he has been quietly offering sacrifice to false gods, grumbling as he goes, and exclaiming to God's prephet as he departs, "Art thou he that troubleth Israel?" In Sodom and Egypt, in that great city where our Lord was crucified, these faithful witnesses are busy—lighting, sweeping—sweeping, lighting—tormenting "those that dwell upon the earth."

But onward, onward the woman presses with her light and broom, all unmindful of the dust she is raising, or of the tumult she is creating among the broken furniture. Intently engaged in her search, determined to find the lost, she heeds not the excitement around. Dagon falls, and is broken to pieces. Pharaoh and his army are swept into the Red Sea. Nineveh and Babylon are clean swept away. Every stone in Jerusalem is overturned, and the place ploughed up. That great mountain which oppressed Israel in our Saviour's time—the Roman empire—has disappeared. Persia, Greece, heathen gods and altars and idols, are all cleaned out. Darkness is overcome by the light of God's word, error by the truth, false doctrine by the purity of the law, and at last the lost is found. The Church has fulfilled her duty, and now comes an hour of rejoicing. The shepherd went to look for the lost sheep in the wilderness, but the woman searches for the lost piece of money in her own house. Christ came to

our world when our whole race was lost in sin. He sought us, and rescued us from the kingdom of Satan. The Church seeks and finds that which was lost within her own sphere. Remember that this parable was spoken to those under the old dispensation, and that the home which the woman swept was the house of Israel, and the publicans and sinners were the "lost sheep of the house of Israel"—those who had been educated under the law and within the bounds of the kingdom. Observe, also, that this class of persons originated from the captivity in Babylon, and were not Gentiles that had found their way into Judea. It is very easy, then, to see the perfect analogy which exists between this people and the present antitype in the Christian Church.

In the parable of the lost sheep the Shepherd returns with it to His own home, the kingdom of heaven, and invites His celestial friends to rejoice with Him. In this the woman does not go out of her own home in search of the lost piece of money, but finds it in her own house, and then invites her terrestrial friends to rejoice with her; and oh! how every true member of Christ's kingdom rejoices when the repentant sinner is found and restored to the bosom of the Church! And no doubt the angels in heaven join also in the rejoicing. All the woman can do is to restore the lost money to its former condition. This is all that the visible Church can do. It requires a divine power to elevate it to a higher sphere, or, in other words, implant within the sinner's breast the power of a divine life.

The shepherd, on his return, tells his friends, "I

have found *my* sheep." It was *His* sheep that had wandered away. He is our Creator. We are His own personal property, by creation as well as by redemption. The woman, on the other hand, does not say, "I have found *my* money which was lost," but "I have found *the* piece of money." The money did not belong to her; it was only loaned to her by the Good Shepherd, who owns both the sheep and the money. The money we daily use in buying and selling has found such a familiar place in our pockets that we imagine it is ours, to do with as we please. Not so! It belongs to the government that coined it, and we can only use it for the legitimate purpose for which it was made. We cannot cut it up or deface it without incurring the displeasure of its true owner. The same may be said of our rea. estate: we are stewards of it, while we are citizensl

In the case of the prodigal son, the father says of him, "*my son.*" We belong to Christ by creation and redemption, but we only belong to the church for a time, as a loan. I think I see here indications of a sense in which, under the New Covenant, we belong to Christ in a way which we did not under the Old. Christ speaks of certain persons as having been given to Him by the Father. Dr. Hodge tells me that these were the elect, who were given to Christ in the covenant of redemption.

Again, the Good Shepherd does not say, "I have found My sheep which *I had lost.*" Christ never lost a sheep out of His fold by His own carelessness. This sheep strayed away, and, going farther and farther away, finally lost itself. But the woman says, "I

have found the piece of money which *I had lost.*" The woman lost this by her own negligence and carelessness, and here she makes confession. If the publicans and sinners were lost from the fold of Israel, it was because the Pharisees and scribes had lost them. They had caused them to wander. Their fathers had caused the nation to be carried away captive to Babylon. They had driven them away from the temple and turned them away from the synagogue, and now they gather up their garments for fear that they might be polluted by coming in contact with them. Far better would it have been for them to have imitated the woman with her candle and broom, as did Christ and His disciples, and have gone into the filth and dust and dirt, and worked away till they had restored them to purity and holiness and happiness.

Bible students have noticed here that the friends and neighbors invited home to rejoice with the woman are in the feminine gender—a peculiarity of the Greek text which we do not find in the English translation. The same peculiarity of expression is to be found in the Spanish. *Amigo* is a male friend; *amiga* is a female friend. Many have supposed from this circumstance, and the immediate reference to the angels in the following verse, that these female friends were guardian angels; but this cannot be the case, as the Greek word *αγγελος* is masculine, and not feminine. But I must confess that I am skeptical upon this whole question of guardian angels. I can understand how the church, composed of weak, fallible, sinful mortals, all sinning daily, may lose

the Master's sheep from the fold—a sin which she must repent of, and which alone can be atoned for by a Saviour's blood; but that angels, who are wise and holy, should commit such a sin, and that without condemnation, is more than I can believe. Paul says that "we shall judge angels." If this is literal, and I arrive to be one of the judges, I shall certainly give my vote to have all such angels condemned. The only guardian angel I know anything about is the angel of Jacob—the angel that stopped the mouths of the lions in the den where Daniel was cast,—Christ, the Guardian angel of the sanctified believer. I would rather understand that the invitation which the woman extends to her friends to rejoice with her to be a future invitation, which the church, through coming ages, extends to the Gentiles —the outside world—to rejoice with her in the blessings of the gospel and its great salvation.

And now, in the moral we find an appeal to their patriotism—their interest as a nation. It is certainly to the interest of the nation that all the lost sheep should be gathered in, as well as that all the money they have lost should be restored to them. The labor of mining and coining the metal, as well as the labor of the woman in earning it, are all at stake. The lost money had cost the woman many an hour of toil and frugal economizing, and she cannot afford to lose it. But just here Satan drags in his great idol, *self*, blinding the Pharisee to the interest of God's church and kingdom, and, yes, to his own personal interest also when it conflicts with the adoration paid to the idol—a monster that will induce

a man to cut off his right hand or pluck out his right eye rather than that men should think that he is not holier and better and wiser than others.

The parable of the ten pieces of silver closes by saying, "There is joy in the presence of God over one sinner that repenteth." And the language used at the closing of the parable of the lost sheep is still more emphatic: "Joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine *just persons* that need no repentance." Upon this passage Alford comments as follows: "They are the subjectively righteous; and this saying respects their own view of themselves, (or if it be required that the words should be literally explained, seeing that these ninety-nine *did not err*, then I see no other way but to suppose them, in the deeper meaning of the parable, to be the *worlds that have not* fallen, and the one that has strayed our human nature in this our world.)" There can be no doubt but our world is a very great sinner, but it is far from being a repentant sinner. I have no idea that the Pharisees who were present on this occasion had any conception of the world of space, consequently cannot suppose that Christ in addressing them should use language so far above their comprehension. Alford's mistake is that of tens of thousands, who suppose that Christ related these parables, not to a company of Jews, such as was then gathered around Him, consisting of publicans and sinners, scribes and Pharisees, but to a company of Englishmen—English Christians—just such as Dean Alford was accustomed to preach to in his own land.

The Pharisees and scribes were all very zealous of the law. And now, if we look into a Greek dictionary, we will find that the word translated here "just persons," means persons who "conformed to the customs;" in this case, *those who conformed to Jewish law.* Sinners, then, according to their ideas, were just the reverse of *just;* that is, they were persons who from some cause could not partake of the temple and synagogue service. They were unclean, suffering with bodily defilement, either natural, accidental, or imposed. They should have had, and possibly many of them did have, some vague idea of the purity or defilement of the soul, which their outward condition symbolized.

The Pharisees even went so far as to impose laws of ceremonial purity, which were not to be found in the law of Moses; and Christ often reproved them for it. On one occasion they found fault with Jesus because His disciples did not wash their hands before eating. "He answered, and said unto them, Well hath Esaias prophesied of you hypocrites, as it is written, This people honoreth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me. Howbeit, in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrine the commandments of men. Full well do ye reject the commandment of God, that ye may keep your own tradition." Now they would call the disciples of Christ sinners, not because they kept the law of Moses, but because they did not keep their revised version of Moses' law. They excluded the publicans from the synagogue and temple because they came in daily contact with the officers of the Roman gov-

ernment, upon the ground that every person who came in contact with an unclean person himself became unclean.

The Pharisees were continually complaining that Christ was a friend of publicans and sinners. On one occasion He had called a publican, named Matthew, and as He sat at meat with him many publicans and sinners, seeing Matthew in His company, came and sat with them. When the Pharisees saw it, they began to inquire of His disciples, "Why eateth your Master with publicans and sinners?" When Jesus heard it, He answered, "They that are whole need not a physician, but they that are sick;" and then immediately adds, "I am not come to call the *righteous*, but sinners to repentance." The word "righteous" here, is synonymous with *just persons;* that is, those who were justified under the old dispensation. We must bear in mind that there is a wide difference between them and the *sanctified* under the reign of the gospel. On another occasion, a Pharisee had invited Him to dine with him, and while He sat at the table a woman came, who was a sinner, bearing an alabaster box of very precious ointment, which she poured on His feet. When the Pharisee saw it he thought to himself, "This man, if He were a prophet, would have known who and what manner of woman this is." According to the modern idea of the meaning of the word "sinner," this woman is supposed to have been a very vile character. Any bodily defect that would exclude her from the synagogue and temple, would constitute her a sinner in the eyes of a Pharisee. A wo-

man suffering from a disease which excluded her from the temple and synagogue, and from all intercourse with other people, so that, according to the Levitical law, she could not even touch another without polluting him, and causing him in turn to pass through a ceremonial purification, came slyly behind Jesus, and touched the hem of His garments. She had not polluted Him, as she supposed she had done, *but He healed her.*

Jesus feared no bodily defilement. It is true that on one occasion He met ten men that were lepers, standing afar off (according to the requirements of the law), saying, "Jesus, Master, have mercy upon us." And He commanded them to go and show themselves to the priests; but upon other occasions He put his hands upon them and healed them. He also put His hands upon a dead body, and restored it to life; and again, we find Him seated at the table of Simon the leper, and eating with him, regardless of any bodily defilement or the criticisms of the Pharisees, who, for this act alone, would class Him with the sinners. In the case of the blind man restored to sight, recorded by John, they did not hesitate to class Him with sinners because He had performed a miracle on the Sabbath day. "Therefore said some of the Pharisees, this man is not of God, because, others said, How can a man that is a sinner do such miracles? And there was a division among them." They could not understand Him—He was a mystery to them.

There appears to have been a very general belief among them that any bodily defect that excluded

them from the temple service was a direct result of sin. A lame or blind person, or one suffering any bodily deformity, could not officiate as a priest; but it appears that the Pharisees took occasion to exclude all such from the court, as well as from the sanctuary, considering him in some way a sinner, and hence the general application of the word "sinner" to all such, irrespective of the condition of the heart; consequently, when the disciples first saw this blind man they asked, "Master, who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?" And, as a natural result, when he who was born blind, but whose eyes were now opened, completely overwhelmed His adversaries with arguments, proving that no unclean person could open a blind man's eyes, they fell back upon their own arbitrary law: he was born blind, consequently unclean, and so they say, "Thou wast altogether born in sin," *and they cast him out of the synagogue.*

It is now an easy thing to understand who the "just persons"—the *righteous*—under the old dispensation, were. Its professors may have been pure in heart, or they may have been but unclean hypocrites. Their righteousness was that spoken of in the eighteenth chapter of Ezekiel—a righteousness from which a man could turn away—a grace from which a man may fall, and within which the germ of eternal life may be found, or none of the old dispensation could be saved. But now Christ comes with a higher righteousness,—His own righteousness, and not that which He has obtained from His own personal obedience,—"His righteousness."

(Ezekiel xviii. 24.) Accepting Christ's righteousness, they become no longer "*just* persons" alone, but *sanctified* persons, or saints. From this righteousness there is no turning away—no falling from grace.

Here then, we behold Christ's miracles in an entirely new light, and His language becomes perfectly clear, when He says: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, because He hath anointed Me to preach the gospel to the poor. He hath sent Me to heal the broken hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised." "He came to seek and to save that which was lost."

I understand, then, in order to be saved by Christ, it was just as necessary for the Pharisee to feel himself lost as it was for the publican or prodigal. He may not wander away from his father's home, but Christ will come to him there, and presenting to him the spotless robe of His righteousness, he will at once so see the difference between that and his own garment of a servant, that he will not hesitate to accept it, and thereby enter upon the development of a sanctified soul. But if he refuses to accept Christ and His righteousness, his condemnation is sure. "They shall come from the east and from the west, and sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of God, but *the children of the kingdom* shall be cast out."

THE PRODIGAL SON.

LUKE xv. 11–32.

THIS parable has been termed by Bible expositors "the crown and gem of all the parables;" and although to our private view it may appear to be the most instructive, yet it is hardly proper to compare the teachings of our Lord as we would compare the writings of men, as "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God;" and it is only on account of our limited knowledge that one parable appears to us to be more valuable than another.

There can be no doubt whatever that when our Lord spake this parable He did not intend, by the two brothers, to represent the Jew and Gentile world, and any such misconception of the object of this parable can only lead us astray.

First, The occasion on which it was spoken leaves no doubt but the two brothers were to be found in the audience that He was then addressing, the Pharisee on one hand and the publican on the other, not a hypocritical Pharisee, such as is so often spoken of in the New Testament, but one who complied with all the requirements of the Mosaic law.

Second, Christ did not come to eat and associate with Gentiles. He never on any occasion associated with the officers of the Roman government. Once only did He enter the home of a Gentile ruler, and then He was carried there as a prisoner by His own people.

Third, There is no analogy in the parable to the

Jew and Gentile world. The Gentile was by no means the younger brother. He was at least two thousand years older than the Jew. He was not a prodigal, who had left the bosom of father Abraham, but a citizen of a far country, who kept and lived on swine and other unclean food. He never had a patrimony to squander, and no robe of righteousness, either legal or otherwise, to grow ragged and filthy.

Fourth, The Gentile was born a Gentile, and could not wander away from his father's house and return to it again. Wherever he went he was in Satan's kingdom, unless he came into the kingdom of Israel by circumcision, or into the kingdom of Christ by faith in a risen Saviour.

I have no doubt but the kingdom of Israel was a type of Christ's visible kingdom in the Gentile world as it exists to-day, and that the Pharisee and publican represents two elements existing in that Church; but the antitype is not the primary, but the secondary object of the parable. The two persons intended to be represented by our Lord in this parable, by the two brothers, were, by the one, those Jews who were legally righteous, and by the other, those who were not. Faith in Christ, the risen Saviour, except as the ceremonial law was a shadow of Him, must be left out of the question. Until Christ died on the cross, this legal righteousness was strictly required, and yet the salvation of the soul then, as now, depended upon a work of the Holy Spirit in the heart.

There probably can be no doubt but the publicans were sons of Abraham. Zaccheus was a publican, and Luke tells us that he was "a son of Abra-

ham." Levi was a publican, and his name alone is proof that he was a Jew; and we are told that the publicans came to the baptism of John, who most assuredly would have baptized none of them had they been Gentiles. In fact, had they not been Jews, Christ would not have associated with them; for He Himself says, when requested by a Gentile woman to heal her daughter, "I am not sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel;" that is, to those who had wandered away from the fold of the legally righteous. Christ came in person only to the house of Israel. There are only two instances on record where He extended a helping hand to any Gentile. One was the case of the centurion, who could not receive Him under his roof because he was a Gentile and Christ a Jewish teacher, and His assistance was given only by the urgent entreaty of the Jews themselves. The other case was that of the Syrophenician woman; and here assistance was not rendered until after He had insinuated, according to the custom of His own people, that she was a Gentile dog. The Gentiles were not to be received into the outward and visible kingdom until the Holy Ghost was given, and this could not be done until after Christ's personal mission was finished. "If I go away I will send the Comforter unto you." "If I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you." "Tarry at Jerusalem until ye be endued with power from on high." And even after the Holy Ghost was given, no Gentile was received into the Christian Church until eight (some say twelve) years had passed,

Cornelius and his family being the first Gentile converts.

There can be no doubt that the discourse of which these parables are a part, was spoken by Christ in order to justify His conduct in associating with publicans and sinners; and yet these parables, as they are intended to show the relation that men bear to God, must have a yet wider sphere, and are applicable to men everywhere, and at all times, who bear the same relation to Him that the righteous Jew did. Christ came, then, to sinners within the covenant, and to them were the offers of the gospel made, just as He commanded His disciples to tarry at Jerusalem and gain all the adherents that they possibly could before going to the Gentiles—first to the Jews, then to Samaritans, and finally to distant Gentile nations. So Christ, by His Spirit, comes now, first to the children of the covenant, and then to the outside world; and while the great commission is as binding upon us as it was upon the apostles, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature," yet we are under as binding obligations to "tarry at Jerusalem" until we are fully endued with power from on high, and until, like the disciples, we have studied and learned the value of these parables, with which the Divine Teacher taught His disciples as an example for us. A command still farther back is binding upon us, "Go ye not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not; but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." The children of the covenant are to receive our especial attention before we carry the

gospel to those who have never belonged to the visible fold.

"Father, give me the portion of goods that falleth to me." Here is the first point of divergence. The younger son feels uneasy under his father's restraint, and wished to have more freedom, to find himself at liberty to follow his own inclinations. And now, as we come to examine this parable, the first question which presents itself to our minds is, What is intended to be represented by "the portion of goods that falleth to me," as the younger son says, and the "living" which the father divided with them, and that "all" which the younger son gathered together? We may suppose that in the type it was a portion of goods or property which he could carry away, or turn into ready cash, and put in his pocket, or exchange for bills which he could draw on brokers elsewhere. But in the application of the parable what does it mean? What were the goods which a publican or Pharisee could thus receive from his father Abraham, and in the end waste and squander?

Now, if we think a moment, we will see that, whatever they were, they were something that would make him independent of his father, and to a certain extent put him on a level with his father. Now, can we not recall to mind a case where Satan suggested to a human soul the idea of partaking of something that would put that soul on a level with God, and consequently render it independent of God? Do we not remember that, when he tempted our first parents with the forbidden fruit, he said, "Ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil," and that

the tree on which that fruit grew was called "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil"? Again, observe that it is not said that the father gave to the younger son his portion of the *inheritance*, but "he divided to them his living;" that is, he gave to each an equal share of his income. We must here bear in mind that the portion of goods received by the younger brother was not his eternal inheritance. If we examine the original, we will find that he asked for his portion of the inheritance; *ουσιας = the principal, the substance.* But the father did not give it to him; "he divided unto them his living;" *τον βιον = his living, the interest, the income.* He gave him what was his as a son of Abraham, and not what he was heir to as a son of Christ. The eternal inheritance was as yet given to neither, but held in reserve until that decisive hour when they would be declared sons of God or sons of Satan. Of this "living," it will be observed that each received an equal share. The older one received as much as the younger, but as he remained at home he did not squander his share. The very act of going away from home was the squandering. I repeat the question, then, Was not the knowledge of good and evil a knowledge of the law and the prophets, and is not a knowledge of the law and the prophets a knowledge of good and evil? And again, I ask, was not this the true living or heritage which God gave to ancient Israel? I admit that it may be objected, that the inheritance which the younger son received was something that he squandered and lost, and that the knowledge of good and evil cannot be lost. But then, if he made

a bad use of this knowledge, would not that be the same to him as to squander and lose it? The knowledge which our first parents gained by eating the forbidden fruit was never lost, either to themselves or to their descendants, yet by it they lost Paradise, and gained an inheritance of misery and death.

But let us see what the Scriptures say on this subject. Paul asks the question, "What advantage hath the Jew [over the Gentile]? Or what profit is there in circumcision?" and answers, "Much every way; chiefly because that unto them were committed the oracles of God." This, then, was the inheritance—"the oracles of God." And David confirms this when he says, "Thy testimonies have I taken as a heritage for ever." These testimonies —the law and the prophets—are also represented as a food, a sustenance, *a living.* "I will feed them with the heritage of Jacob." This "*living*," then, if not food itself, was something that would purchase food and raiment and happiness. "Man shall not live by bread only, but by *every word* that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord." (Deut. viii. 3.) The manna which the Israelites ate in the desert, called by the psalmist the "bread of heaven" and "angels' food," was undoubtedly a type of the word of God contained in the Old Testament, while the Word that was made flesh—that true bread that came down from heaven for the life of the world—is Christ. The Old Testament, then, was the portion of the prodigal publican, and must be taken fresh every day from the Father's hands.

But perhaps my question is too broad and covers

too much ground. Let us see. That there was a "tree of knowledge of good and evil" in paradise implies that the "trail of the serpent" had polluted paradise before man was placed in it. God had sown good seed there, but Satan's tares came up with it. The good was from God, but the evil was not. The law and the prophets can produce only good. The prodigal, while he remained in his father's house, received only good from the law; it was food and raiment for him; but when he went out into the world, and saw how exceedingly sinful he was, he found the righteousness of the law in which he had trusted to be but polluted rags, and the nourishment and happiness he had derived from it to be but "swine's husks." Nevertheless, "the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good. Was then that which is good made death unto me? God forbid. But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good; that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful." (Rom. vii. 12, 13.)

The goods, then, which the younger son squandered were the blessings which he had received from Moses and the prophets. They were only valuable as they were daily received by him under a father's restraint. Outside of a father's restraining hand, he becomes surrounded by temptations which his legal righteousness cannot resist, and he sees himself what he naturally is, poor and ragged, starving and vile. We do not read that the elder brother lost or squandered anything. He remained under a father's

tender care, and was not surrounded with temptation as his brother was.

Again, observe the younger son remained awhile, at least some days, and I think the expression "not many days after" may mean some months, perhaps, when compared with the whole life of man, in his father's house after he had received his portion. He did not start out immediately. We are not to understand that the giving up the portion was the immediate cause of his departure. His apostasy was gradual; first one dislike, and then another pride, gradually growing in his heart as he beheld how rich he was with his small bag of treasure.

He went into a far country. "He took his journey"—wandered farther and farther away. He went away from the household of father Abraham —left the dominion of the law, and, as he supposed, was outside of all restraint. In the case of the publican, we understand that he went into the service of the Roman empire. He became Cæsar's servant, engaged in the collection of Cæsar's taxes, or, in other words, collecting money to feed Cæsar's soldiers —unclean swine. The Pharisees might well term this *feeding Gentile* swine.

"*He wasted his substance with riotous living.*" As he participates in the sins of the world he fails to draw any spiritual comfort from Moses and the prophets. He leaves a father's restraint, but the instructions received in childhood go with him; and as he breaks these, they cease to be a companion, and become an avenger of blood. The legal righteousness of the Jew was directly symbolized by the gar-

ment which he wore. That garment, so clean and smooth when daily renewed by a father's provident care, becomes soiled and worn with the journey, and is soon filled with holes, for, as the prophet expresses it, "All our righteousnesses are as filthy rags." He wasted his legal righteousness. He has no spiritual food. Every day brings its multiplicity of sins and their consequent remorse. Day by day the pure, spotless robe of the righteousness of the law—now his only inheritance—becomes more and more defiled, and when it is all gone to rags, he finds himself in want.

And then there arose a famine in that land—"*a mighty famine.*" What was this famine? I think that the prophet Amos describes this famine when he says: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord God, that I will send a famine in the land, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of the Lord; and they shall wander from sea to sea, and from the north even to the east; they shall run to and fro to seek the word of the Lord, and shall not find it. In that day shall the fair virgins and young men faint for thirst. They that swear by the sin of Samaria, and say, Thy god, O Dan, liveth; and, The manner of Beersheba liveth; even they shall fall, and never rise up again." (Amos viii. 11–14.)

I feel fully persuaded that this prophecy was in the mind of our Saviour when He pronounced the parable upon which we are meditating. The connection between the publicans and sinners of Judea and the Samaritans was on the ground of one and the same sin. The sin of Samaria was that they

worshipped heathen idols. The idol in Dan was worshipped by the renegade Jews, as was also the idol in Beersheba. It was a famine for the truth—just such a famine as is to-day raging in Mexico and South America. There is *food* enough, *an abundance of it;* great storehouses filled with it; churches and cathedrals in abundance, where black-robed priests minister, not only on the Lord's day, but every morning in the year, dispensing bread to the starving souls; *but it is food for swine*, and swine feed upon it, and devour it with greediness; but oh! what tasteless food for a Christian who has for years lived on the fruit which grows upon the tree of divine knowledge —God's living word.

False teachers are in our midst, every day dispensing bread—adulterated bread, falsehood and truth intermingled—Universalists, Unitarians, Spiritualists, and hosts of others, feeding the hungry with what appears to give a temporary satisfaction, but cannot save a soul from death.

"*And he went and joined himself to a citizen of a far country.*" This was the position held by the publican. He had become a servant of Cæsar's. In the antitype, the prodigal sells himself to the world, and becomes a servant of the world. The publican was in the employ of Pontius Pilate, or if he lived in Galilee, he was in the service of Herod, both being officers of the Roman empire. It may also have been possible that the publicans had more or less been induced to observe the worship of the pagans by whom they were employed, false gods having been introduced, as they had been in former times,

among the Samaritans. If such was the case, then they could at once see the rugged contrast between the worship of these heathen idols and the worship of the true and living God.

This new master, it appears, does not feel the famine himself—at least he has an abundance of Gentile food. He has a drove of swine and plenty to feed them on; it is only the poor Jew who suffers with famine. And now this new master sends him to feed swine. Oh! how degrading to the son of a proud Jewish nobleman. No employment in the world so degrading. The very touch was to him pollution. How soon his fine garments are torn and bespotted with filth. His fine robe is not only torn to rags, but he suffers with hunger. He would fain have satisfied his hunger with the swine's food, but no man gave unto him. How eagerly the swine devoured their husks, but it afforded no satisfaction to him. Poor and naked, perishing in sight of food, he could not eat. Oh, for one morsel of the bread of heaven now! Oh, how long will men desire to feed the immortal soul with the food of the serpent! Falsehood and blasphemy and deceit may be devoured eagerly by Satan's swine, but these can never satisfy the longings of an immortal soul that has once tasted angel's food. Christ is that bread. To the lost sheep of Israel is He sent.

Just here, when the prodigal is in his state of lowest misery and degradation, there is an important point which calls our attention. It is this: that while in his father's house he longed for this situation, and now he has it; his wish is gratified. We are

told that the Israelites were fed with angel's food while in the wilderness, and yet they longed for the flesh-pots of Egypt; and the inspired apostle says that "in heart they went back to Egypt." It was just because the Israelites longed for the liberty and freedom of the Gentile nations around them that they were delivered over to their idolatry. It was because they desired the freedom of the Roman empire that they were delivered over to the Roman masters; and then, when they rebelled against their masters, they were overcome, and those who were not slain were carried away captives to strange lands, only to serve as slaves, beholding in triumphal processions the wealth and sacred vessels of their temple and country publicly exhibited as relics of what they had been, and as mementos of their defeat, and now symbols of their degradation and misery. And then to see themselves and their children sold as slaves to serve these same hated Roman dogs was but to be placed in the same position occupied by the prodigal when feeding swine. They had to come daily in contact with those that they held as impure, partake of their unclean food, even serve in preparing and cooking it, and wait upon their tables. The sons and daughters of these very same Pharisees, who complained that Christ associated with publicans, were carried away to Rome by Titus, and there, in a strange land, made to dish up swine's flesh and serve at the tables of their unclean masters, starving until they were compelled to partake of the unclean food out of polluted vessels. Oh! what suffering this law of prohibition entailed upon the children of those

who said to our Lord, "We are Moses' disciples." We notice on the part of Christ in these parables an indication that He would have them conciliate the Romans rather than to blindly resist them. He does not condemn the publicans for having entered into the service of the Romans, but rather encourages than condemns them. This becomes more apparent, as we shall see, in the advice He gave them in closing the parable of the unjust steward; and in the end, He finally broke down the partition wall which separated the Jew from the Gentile by entirely removing the law of carnal ordinances. Here, then, we see that, prophetically, not the publican who conciliated the Romans, but the legally righteous Jew—the scribe and the Pharisee—became, in the end, the prodigal son, with no hope of return but by exchanging their legal righteousness for the righteousness of Christ. And even down to the present day, after eighteen centuries of tedious wandering, ever tormented by the presence of unclean beasts, the dog and the hog, the flesh of the latter in some form mingled with almost every article of food, while in every transaction they have been compelled to receive and pocket a coin bearing on the one side the image of a foreign king, and on the other that of a heathen god; nevertheless, behold what an intense lust is manifested by the remnant of this people for the mammon of unrighteousness, (supposing gold to be what is intended by this mammon)—feeding upon Gentile husks, earnestly laboring for and hoarding up that which purchases the food of Gentile kings, and bears their "image and superscription."

The *husks* that the swine did eat is now universally conceded to be the long, sweet, and very crooked (hence κεραια=little horns) pods of the carob tree, which grows abundantly in Eastern countries. I have seen large quantities of it collected in the Argentine Republic as good for horses and cattle. A light, rather pleasant bread is made from it; also a refreshing drink, used in case of sickness.

"*He came to himself.*" He begins to meditate. Here we have the first step in the prodigal's return: he came to himself. Now, I ask, what was this coming to himself, but a returning to a former state of mind which he possessed before he went astray? Love to his father, respect for his government, and love for the home he had abandoned, and especially a longing desire to once more partake of his father's table and be clothed by his provident care. Does this look as though the soul of this prodigal was created and born in Satan's kingdom, and must first be converted from that kingdom in order to become a member of God. Most assuredly not.

The publican was born in the kingdom of Israel, the visible kingdom of God; and yet he was literally born under the dominion of Cæsar, as well as in the land of Judea. There was a higher power pretending to claim him as its citizen—a power running contrary to his birthright in father Abraham. In this respect the whole Jewish nation had become a prodigal. They were all under the dominion of the Roman empire—all paying tribute to Cæsar, and all daily using his money. And they had been in this condition since the days of captivity in Babylon.

To such an extent was this carried that the chief priests bought their positions from the Roman government, and the whole temple service was carried on under the protection of the Roman rulers. What, then, may be asked, was the difference between the Pharisee and the publican? I answer, just this: the publican recognized the Roman authority as legal—ordained of God (Rom. xiii. 1), while the Pharisee recognized it as a usurped tyranny. The one collected his taxes with a clear conscience, feeling that it was a just tribute which God had imposed upon them by placing the Roman government over them; while the other paid his share under protest, not feeling that it was a just debt, but a compulsory robbery—asserting himself as a son of Abraham, who had never been in servitude to any one. (John viii. 33.) These two persons well represent the saint and sinner of to-day. One confesses his sins and is willing to kiss the rod—submit to all the punishments which God sees fit to impose upon him, either temporary or eternal; while the other ignores his sins, looks upon their punishment as an arbitrary use of power, and with a cold, hard, rebellious heart submits to the temporary as a compulsive necessity from which he cannot escape, and laughs at the idea of future retribution.

But the time is coming when their robe of legal righteousness will not avail them. The Roman rulers (Gentile swine) had already torn great rents in it, which they were vainly endeavoring to conceal by casting the blame upon the publicans. John the Baptist, and Christ Himself, in His personal mis-

sion, had despoiled it of its beauty. "Except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye can in no wise enter the kingdom of heaven." The righteousness of the law must yield before the righteousness of the gospel.

"*I will arise and go to my father.*" The Pelagians claimed that this was a proof that man made the first effort, and that God helps him. Calvinists claim that God first draws man—that the first move is upon the part of God, and that without divine assistance man cannot help himself. This is one of the fundamental doctrines of the Presbyterian Church. We base our views upon such passages as, "No man can come to Me except the Father which hath sent Me draw him, and I will raise him up at the last day;" "without Me ye can do nothing;" "all that the Father giveth Me shall come to me;" "no man can come to Me except it were given him of My Father." This doctrine is stated in many places in Scripture, and is also taught by analogy. Israel could not come out of Egypt until God sent Moses to bring them out. They could not drive the Canaanites out except the Lord of hosts commanded their armies. They could not return from the captivity in Babylon until God put it into the heart of Babylon's king to send them away, and He raised up men to lead them back to their own land. The same thing is taught in these parables. The lost sheep could not return to the flock, nor even make the first move in that direction. The lost piece of money could not restore itself to the woman's pocket. Nor is the statement here, "I will arise and go to

my father," a contradiction to this doctrine. We have already seen that the resolution which he formed, to arise and go to his father, was not the first step. His very first step was coming to himself. Our first parents partook of the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, and their eyes were opened. This opening of the eyes was a divine work. The result was that they found themselves *naked*—lost to holiness. The prodigal had now partaken of good at home and evil abroad, and now his eyes are opened. He comes to himself. This is a divine work. The result is, he finds himself *ragged*—lost to purity. If the Father had not first shown him that he was lost, he would never have been drawn to the Father. The divine image can only be restored by the power that created it. If the Father draws him not, he will be satisfied with swine's food.

Coming to himself—finding himself *lost*—was the first step towards regeneration; but would it not be better to call this a *generation of the Spirit*, rather than regeneration itself? I do not think that we can claim that he was fairly regenerated until he was restored to his father's household. Regenerated while in the service of a citizen of Satan's kingdom he could not be. Regenerated while far away from his father's pure home he could not be. Regenerated while daubed with the filth of unclean swine he could not be. Regenerated while he was clothed with the tattered rags of the legal righteousness of the Mosaic law he could not be. Taking these things into consideration, I feel fully justified in using the term

regeneration in its true scriptural sense, applying it to *sanctification* (as far as complete in this life); and applying to this first beginning of the Spirit's work in the heart the more appropriate term, *generation* of the Spirit. "Coming to himself" is a conviction of his lost condition. He is not saved until he has passed through the portal of his father's mansion. That portal is Christ. When the prodigal says, "I will arise and go to my father," we observe a marked contrast in this parable to those which precede it. The stupid sheep could not restore itself to the fold. It had to be carried back by the shepherd. The lost piece of money could not return to the woman's possession until she had searched for it. The leper could not cleanse himself of his leprosy, but he could fulfil the requirements of the ceremonial law as prescribed in his case. The blind man could not cure his own blindness, but he could "go and wash in the pool of Siloam." And so with the prodigal. He could not restore himself to the heirship. He could not make himself a son of God through the gospel; but having already known the law—tasted and found that it was good—he could go to his father, and ask to be restored to servitude to the law with a clean conscience. The rest is by grace a free gift.

"*Father, I have sinned.*" Confession of sin, humble confession, is what God requires. Without this it is useless to go to the Father. "Father, forgive us our sins" is the first and only prayer that will make us reconciled to God.

But who are the "hired servants" spoken of here? These could not be sons of Abraham. The idea ex-

pressed in the parable is, that the two sons are sons of Abraham, but this the hired servants were not. Servants among the Jews in times of prosperity were usually foreigners—Gentile proselytes; and it was a prevailing opinion that when the Messiah would come that the whole Gentile world would be in some sort of servitude to them. Is not the idea expressed by the prodigal, then, that the father would put him on a level with the Gentile proselytes who lived in his own house and served him? Do not make a son of me, but receive me as one of these Gentiles. And is not that the only way in which a Jew, at the present day, can enter the kingdom of God? This, to some extent, was the position of the publican. He looked upon the Gentile rulers, not as enemies, but servants whom God had chosen, and under whose rule the nation was more prosperous and happy than it had ever been before, and he accepts the position of living with them rather than to rise in open rebellion, or do as the Pharisees did—cherish rebellion in their hearts while outwardly professing the utmost friendship for the Romans. I am under the impression, however, that when the prodigal speaks of the *hired servants*, that he has reference to a great change which his nation would undergo in the near future. The promise had been given to them through Moses, "Ye shall be unto Me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation," and this promise had never been fulfilled; but now the Messiah was about to come, who would "sit as a refiner and purifier of silver, and He shall purify the sins of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, and they shall offer unto the Lord an of-

fering in righteousness." The Pharisees and scribes had up to this time acknowledged themselves servants of the law; but the time was now near at hand when they would become a royal priesthood, hence their strict observance of all ceremonial righteousness, they being already the teachers and guides of the people. In the near future all illiterate persons, together with all Gentile nations, who were to become proselytes, would occupy the court and be servants to them. The idea of the prodigal, then, was, that if he returned God would receive him as a servant, to labor in the field and sleep in the court, but that all claim to heirship he had forfeited, and made no pretensions to recognition in the coming kingdom. Were this not the case, I cannot understand why he should use the word υἱος = son, and not τεκνον = child, as in the 31st verse; for virtually neither he nor his elder brother could be *sons* of God until the great change should take place which would make them a holy priesthood in the coming kingdom.

In order that we may get the full import of the parable, we must remember that Christ looks upon the heart, and may receive a repentant prodigal, while the faithful apprentice to Jewish law, on serving his time, may be rejected. It is the humility of the prodigal that receives Christ's approbation. He would come back as a servant, take his place in the court amid the children and servants—a servant, not of sin, but of the law.

"*His father saw him when he was yet a great way off.*" That loving Father's eyes had never been off his erring son. Through all his wanderings that

Father's Spirit had followed him. It was that kind Father who had hedged in his way while in a strange land, and it was that Father who had afflicted him for his own good. It was that Father who had brought him back again to himself, and put it into his heart to return to the parental roof. It was that Father in the Holy Spirit that had nerved him to the extremely difficult task of confessing his guilt, and that Father now on his return bestows upon him the kiss of reconciliation, even before the confession had been made. Without the magnetic influence of that Father's Spirit, he would have perished amid the polluting swine, and it would have been the very fact that that Father's Spirit continually strove with him that would have turned his destruction into a hell. Without the strivings of this Father's Spirit in the breast of every sinner, I should most certainly accept the erronous doctrine of the annihilation of the soul of the wicked; but it is because men resist this Spirit that they are punished in the eternal world. And here, again, we may inquire, was this kiss of reconciliation regeneration? I think that we may answer that it was not. Still wearing the old garment polluted with swine's filth, he was still under the old law. Repentance, confession, and reconciliation all come under the old law. He could not be regenerated in the true Scriptural sense of the word until his garment was changed, and he had passed over into the new dispensation. Regeneration does not mean to become a servant of the law, but a *son of God* through the gospel.

"*Bring forth the best robe and put it on him.*"

This may be translated the *first robe.* Alford translates it "*the first and best.*" This was not such a garment as he had worn before going away; nor was it such as his brother had on, he being still clothed in the legal righteousness of the old covenant. The robe which is now given to him is the robe of the new covenant—the righteousness of Christ. And now I say, this change of garment was regeneration—the exchange of the old dispensation for the new—Moses for Christ. This change of garment is a symbol of regeneration—passing out of the old kingdom into the new.

"*Put a ring on his hand.*" By the ring we understand the work of the Holy Spirit. *The Spirit seals*, and a ring in the East was not worn for ornament, but for sealing. Our custom of wearing rings on the fingers merely for ornament is altogether foreign to the idea expressed here. Any article of this kind which the Scriptures may speak of must have a useful object in view, and not merely that of gratifying any selfish pride or taste. Every article of dress, with the ancient Jew, was significant—typical or symbolical; and so we may say of every custom, habit, or occupation. A ring was not worn to gratify selfish pride, as with us. Dancing, for instance, is often spoken of in the Scriptures; but the Jews did not dance for self-gratification, as people do in our day. All was done to the glory of God.

As a householder was supposed to have continual need of a seal in transacting his business, it was worn in the form of a ring upon the finger, as a place of convenience. As the Holy Spirit, the Comforter

under the new covenant, (not the Spirit in a limited form presiding over, as in the old dispensation,) is always that which seals, we can have no doubt as to the meaning of this ring. Paul's words are very appropriate here: "After that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation, in whom also ye believed, ye were *sealed* with that Holy Ghost of promise." The ring indicates that the father had imparted to him a portion of his own power, and authority to transact business for him, and seal his public documents. This was precisely the power that was delegated to the apostles on the day of Pentecost by the appearance of the Holy Ghost.

"*Shoes on his feet.*" Shoes were not worn in the East except by kings and noblemen. The sandals worn by the great mass of the people were a symbol of servitude. Slaves went barefoot. Strangers coming on a journey, servants laboring in the field, as well as other members of the family, left their sandals outside of the door, while the shoes of the nobleman were worn inside. Having been the servant of a foreigner, the prodigal probably returned barefoot, or wearing the symbol of his servitude, and is now made a nobleman. The other brother, who is in the field, doubtless wore sandals, being as yet a servant, although apparently an heir. The shoes are a symbol of the freedom of the gospel. "Having the feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace." We have here, then, in the shoe and sandal, symbols of the two dispensations—the law and the gospel.

"*Bring hither the fatted calf and kill it.*" What is meant by the fatted calf? Tertullian, and others of the early fathers, saw in this calf a symbol of the Eucharist or Lord's Supper. I think that it has a higher meaning than this. The ox, to the Jew, was ever a symbol of servitude, being the companion of his labors in the field. The Jews were servants of the law. The killing of the fatted calf, then, was virtually a symbol of the abrogation of this servitude, and a declaration of independence. This now gives us new light on the meaning of the wedding garment spoken of in the Scriptures, as well as of the declaration, "He took upon Himself the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of man; and being formed in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." "Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us."

Observe here an important point. The father does not clothe the son himself, or kill the fatted calf with his own hand, but he commands his servants to do this for him. I understand by this, that when one who has been brought up under Bible instruction wanders away, and returns, that he is first to put himself under the ministry of the Word. This was done by the early converts after the day of Pentecost. The Church cannot provide the garment, but she can assist the convert in putting it on. The Church cannot make the sacrificial table, but she can prepare it under the Father's directions. Before the resurrection of our Lord, all were ser-

vants, even John the Baptist and the disciples of our Lord. These were called on to do these duties then. The heirs (not to the exclusion of the servants,) are called upon to perform these duties now. After the coming of the Comforter, the gospel ministry takes the lead in this important work, not murmuring that a wanderer has returned, but rejoicing that a brother has been restored and saved from death and hell.

Another point of importance, which should not be forgotten, is, that in the former parables the search was without. The sheep could not return to the fold, nor the lost piece of money restore itself—they had to be searched after. But the prodigal returns because there was a Divine light searching within him. Here, then, we again see the characteristics of the two dispensations. The state of discipleship is an outward influence brought to bear upon the heart. The new dispensation is a divine life within, leading the son of the Jewish nobleman from the hog-pen up to a seat at his father's table, and in the antitype leading the sinner from the filth and pollution of Satan's kingdom to a throne in heaven. This influence was commenced under the old dispensation, and brought to maturity under the new, and it is that imperfect part of the work only before full sanctification which is presented in this parable. We have, then, in the three parables, 1st, the minister's interest in bringing a wanderer back; 2nd, the Church's interest in seeing a lost one restored; and 3rd, God's interest in the salvation of His children.

THE ELDER BROTHER.

We now commence upon another part of this parable—that of the son who remained at home. We have thus far been treating of the prodigal who wandered away and returned; but as our Lord at the commencement of the parable had told us that there were *two sons*, He now goes on to speak of the other.

"*The elder son was in the field.*" This shows that although he may have been an heir, he yet labored as a servant, according to Paul's words: "The heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant, though he may be lord of all." We therefore find him in the fields, perhaps cultivating the land, or attending to his father's flocks.

As he "*drew nigh he heard music and dancing.*" In eastern countries music and dancing were performed by musicians and dancers employed for the purpose, not so much to amuse the spectators as to instruct them. The family did not engage in the dancing. Their mourning was also, and is to the present day, performed by others. This is what Jeremiah refers to when he says, "Call in the mourning women." (Jer. ix. 17.) Every domestic affair of life was supposed to have some religious object in view. Psalms were sung or chanted, accompanied with music and dancing, or mourning (as the circumstances required) in order that those psalms might the more readily be committed to memory, and their lessons be the more impressive. This is the true way to glorify God in our daily walk and

conversation, not that God needs our praise, but that we may be benefited. The direct object on the part of man is to glorify God; while the object on the part of God is that man himself should be instructed and benefited.

"*He called one of the servants and asked what these things meant.*" We notice here something wrong. He was suspicious that something was being done which did not suit him. He is beginning to lose confidence in his father, perhaps thinking that his father could do something that would not be to his interest. And now what a perfect exhibition of what poor human nature ever has done, and ever will do, in such a case! Instead of going directly to his father at once, where he would have learned the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, he calls one of the servants, and gets a distorted account from him, which, combined with his own suspicions, led him at once to look upon his father as his enemy.

"*And he was angry, and would not go in.*" His father now comes out to remonstrate with him, when he at once compares his own legal life with that of his brother. But he will not even recognize him as his brother. "*This thy son.*" In a reproachful, scornful way he gathers up his unpolluted robes, for fear lest contact with the now cast off garments of the tender of swine might possibly pollute him.

"*Which has devoured thy living.*" It was the father's righteousness which he had bestowed upon his son that the prodigal had squandered. "*With harlots.*" The prophets ever speak of foreign gods and foreign worship as idolatry.

"*As soon as he is come.*" He does not say *returned*, as of one resuming his place, but as of a foreigner who had no right there—an intruder, trespassing on the rights of others.

"*Thou hast killed for him,*" not a kid or a lamb, but the choicest fatted calf in the stall. Now, all this was said upon the supposition that the prodigal had been restored to the same place that he had occupied before he went away. What would he have said if he had known that the father had made a nobleman of him, giving him the finest robe, a seal ring, and a nobleman's shoes?

"*Son, thou art ever with me, and all that I have is thine.*" We do not find the father here answering his son with severity. He manifested no anger, and gently remonstrates with him. He gives him to understand plainly that he is his brother in a father's love, and consequently an heir of the kingdom. He is entirely oblivious to the prodigal's sins, and intensely alive to the one great fact, that this son was dead and is now alive again. "*He was dead.*" The whole period in which the prodigal was sinning against his father is now in the grave of annihilation; it is gone, entirely unknown, and nothing remains in its place but a covered-up and forgotten grave.

We now come to the question, "Who were the *friends* to whom the elder brother refers, when he says, 'Thou never gavest me a kid that I might make merry with my friends?'" Those friends of the elder brother, it appears, did not belong to the family. They were not of the seed of Abraham. There

were but two brothers—the Pharisee and publican. I can find none to fill that condition so well as the officers of the Roman government; and it is true that the Pharisees were guilty of the very same sin for which they condemned the publican. As I have already remarked, they bought their chief offices, especially that of high priest, from the Roman government, and paid for them in Roman coin. When the Pharisee, therefore, condemned the publican, he did just what an unjust judge of the present day would do, when he condemns a poor man to prison for stealing a sheep, and then quietly, deliberately puts a thousand dollars of government funds into his own pocket, because he—fortunately for himself, and unfortunately for us—occupies a position where the law cannot touch him.

Mind, that the question here does not hinge upon the legality of conciliating the Romans, (this was right enough, as we shall see when we come to examine the next parable,) but upon the hypocrisy of the Pharisees in excluding the publicans from religious worship because they gathered the Roman taxes, while they themselves recognized the authority of the Roman government, even publicly declaring "We have no king but Cæsar."

It was a standing rule in the Roman empire, that when they conquered a nation that nation must receive the religion of the empire, and that all temples, and temple ornaments and sacred utensils, should be given over to the use of their heathen gods. They had ever enforced this, except in Judea, and had often tried it there, but had been restrained by a

divine providence. When the elder brother asks a kid to feast with his friends, he would do just what he accuses his brother of when he charges him with squandering his father's substance with harlots. He would give half a kid to the Romans with very good grace, provided he could feast on the other half himself; he would take the worship of his father's temple and share it with the Romans, if he could but enjoy half of it himself. If the publican had paid half the taxes he collected over to the Pharisee, he would never have been excluded from the temple and synagogue service. That great idol *Self* was the god he worshipped.

The parable closes just where the history of the Jewish nation leaves us at the time when Christ pronounced this discourse. The Messiah had come, and the fatted calf was about to be killed. The publican receives Him and enters into the feast, while the parable leaves the father discussing the question without with his elder son, whether he would go in or not. And here I think I can see the full force of the expression, "his father came out and entreated him." After Christ's crucifixion the command was given to the apostles to preach the gospel first to the Jews. The word *apostle* means *one sent out.* They were sent out by the Father, or rather the Father Himself going out by the Holy Spirit *in the apostles.* He entreated the Jews to come into His spiritual kingdom, but they would not; and so remaining out, they are to-day the prodigal son, feeding upon swine's food among all the nations of the earth.

Now, an important question, which has puzzled theologians in all ages, I think is solved by the view which I have here presented. It is this: "Was the righteousness of those intended to be represented by the elder brother real, or only assumed? If real, how are we to account for his treatment of the penitent prodigal? If assumed, how are we to account for his expression, 'I have never transgressed thy commandment,' which the father does not contradict, but confirms by saying, 'Son, thou art ever with me, and all I have is thine'?"

I do not hesitate in answering that his righteousness was *real;* but it was the ceremonial righteousness of the law, and not the righteousness of the gospel. The question as to whether he possessed any moral righteousness, or did not possess any, does not enter here, and must be left entirely out of consideration. The decision of that question is still in the future, and will be determined by the conclusion he arrives at concerning the Father's entreaties, as to whether he will go in and partake of the gospel fruit or not. He is now in the condition of a student of a school just before examination day arrives. Evidence has been given that he has been faithful in all the outward requirements of the school, but the examination day will prove whether he has learned anything or not.

Many suppose that our Lord represents under the figure of the elder brother the scribes and Pharisees, not as they were, hypocrites, but as they should have been. But this is assuming a ground that is altogether too broad; that is, that *all* the scribes and

Pharisees were hypocrites. This is all wrong. The facts of the case are, that virtually the elder brother was the representative of two classes. The elder brother represents the legally righteous among the Jews, a portion of which was composed of morally righteous persons, and a portion were hypocrites. To condemn *all* the Pharisees as hypocrites is as absurd as it would be to assume that all the publicans were morally righteous. Christ's object in these parables is, first, to appeal to *their pity* as shepherds over the flock of Israel; second, their *sense of duty* as a church; and third, their sympathy with God in the interest He takes in the conversion of sinners; and in doing so He refers to them as one body, representing the synagogue or church of Israel; and then He closes His discourse by showing them their neglect of duty, and presents them in all their horrible deformity in the character of the rich man, and there publicly and wisely condemns them for their want of charity to the poor publican in the form of Lazarus lying at their gate covered with rags and leprosy. The Pharisees were high church men, many of whom had carried their reverence for Moses so far that they had ceased to be disciples of Moses, and had in reality become idolaters, worshipping Moses instead of being instructed by him. "Lo, these many years do I serve thee." Self-aggrandizement, looking for a reward—the servant expecting his pay. Their own selfish interests had rendered them blind to the interests of the publicans. Christ called these the "children of Satan;" "ye are of your father the devil."

Now, the great feast to which the prodigal has been received, and to which the elder brother is invited, is the gospel feast. It is prepared expressly for the legally righteous person, as well as for the repentant sinner, and both are invited to partake of it, and those who partake live. Heretofore the elder brother had been serving IN THE FIELD, that is, he was a servant under the law. Not a kid, but a fatted calf, was killed for him, just as much as it was for his brother; and his salvation now depends, not upon the *service* he had heretofore rendered, (which was valid only as it was recognized by the father as having been performed in obedience and love to a father's will, but worthless if performed through fear of punishment or for self-aggrandizement, with the expectation of a reward,) but upon his acceptance of the father's invitation. Heretofore he had been a servant of the law, but he is now invited to enter into the joy of his Lord—the blessings of the gospel. True, he says that he had not had a kid to feast with his friends, but then he had feasted sumptuously every day with the very best of all friends—his own father. Not one, but a thousand kids had been slain for his especial benefit.

In answer to his request for a kid to make merry with his friends, his father answers, "Thou art ever with me;" that is, I am more to thee than all thy friends. His friends were pagans, or, as he himself termed them in derision, Gentile dogs. It was this desire to share the kid with his friends that had carried Israel away captive to Babylon, and now made him a bondsman to the Roman empire. And

was he not even now literally sharing the kid with his friends, while Roman officers were living on the fat of the land, and sending the tribute-money which the publicans collected to Cæsar's treasury at Rome? If this was not sharing the kid with his friends, I know not what was.

"*All that I have is thine.*" Not a kid, but the fatted calf. Not the fatted calf alone, but my table, my name, my glory, my kingdom—ALL, ALL ARE thine. Why ask for a kid when an empire is thine? Why should you begrudge your brother a share at my table when all the riches of the universe belong to you as well as to him?

Many of these legally righteous Jews accepted the invitation, and entered the gospel kingdom; while to others God's messengers are compelled to speak as did Paul, "Seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, so we turn to the Gentiles."

The elder brother to-day is that person who has from youth maintained an honorable life, has perhaps continued faithful to the church and Sabbath-school and their teachings, has been baptized by his parents. (I mean baptism itself—the baptism of the soul with the water of life—and not the outward ceremony alone.) He may have been obedient to his profession, and been admitted to the sacrament of the Lord's supper, but has done all this either through fear of punishment or for purposes of self-aggrandizement, the hope of reward, and is not yet willing to recognize in spirit and in truth that he is responsible for his brother's keeping; and is as yet

unwilling to pray to the Father, "Not *my* will, but *thine*, be done," although it exalts that brother to a throne and casts himself into a dungeon. The prodigal has been led to feel his own degradation and misery, and can now sympathize with an erring brother, and feel that his care is his own. The gospel feast is not fear through a conscious sense of duty, but liberty and obedience through pure, unadulterated love.

In one prominent point we observe that the parable falls short of the antitype. The analogy is not perfect, because a nobleman, limited in his wealth, cannot represent the Almighty, in whose unlimited power is the wealth of all worlds. An Almighty Father may give to His sons a million kingdoms, and yet have a million more to give. The prodigal squandered one inheritance, but another of infinitely more value is left to him. The Jews have squandered their temporal inheritance, but if they will only come to Christ the spiritual shall be theirs. The first is gone, and cannot be restored. The material Jerusalem is not to be rebuilt. Christ's people can never enter again into servitude under Moses and labor in the field. Such a view only betrays your ignorance of the Scriptures. The parable closes just at that state of affairs which was then transpiring in the history of the Jewish nation. The great sacrifice was about to be consummated on Calvary. The parable does not tell us whether the elder brother was reconciled and went in with his father to the feast, or whether he took the prodigal's place without. We must look elsewhere for a continuance of the

narrative, for it must be remembered that not all the publicans received Christ, neither did all the Pharisees reject Him. We find in the Acts of the Apostles a very full record of that branch of the Pharisees which united with the gospel church. The brethren in Jerusalem told Paul, "Thou seest, brother, how many myriads (tens of thousands) there are among the Jews of them which have believed; and they are all zealous of the law." (Acts xxi. 20.) Being zealous of the Mosaic law is very strong testimony that they were Pharisees. Paul himself was a Pharisee, and the "Pharisee which believed" formed a prominent element in the first council held in Jerusalem. (Acts xv. 5.)

THE CHILDREN OF THE CHURCH.

One, at least, if not *the* peculiar feature of the Baptist Church, which distinguishes it from other denominations, is that of a purely regenerated membership—understanding by *regeneration* those who are sanctified and made members of Christ's spiritual kingdom by the work of the Holy Ghost upon their hearts.

The Presbyterian view may be best expressed in the language of Presbyterian authors. Dr. William A. Stearns, President of Amherst College, says in his work on "Infant Baptism": "Baptized children are in the same enclosure with the parents, and are equally members of the Church, long before they

make any profession of their faith. Properly speaking, the question can never come up, whether they shall join the Church. They belong already, and a profession of religion with them is simply their own acknowledgment of this fact and the obligations it implies." Dr. Charles Hodge says: "The status of baptized children is not a vague or uncertain one, according to the doctrine of the Reformed Church. They are professing Christians; they belong presumptively to the number of the elect." That they are members of the Church, I agree with Dr. Hodge; but that they are *professing Christians*, in the sense of having made an open profession of faith in a risen and glorified Savior, I must deny. They belong to the court, and not to the sanctuary (or sanctified).

The Westminster Confession of Faith says: "Children born within the pale of the visible Church, and dedicated to God in baptism, are under the inspection and government of the Church, and are to be taught to read and repeat the Catechism, the Apostles' Creed, and the Lord's Prayer. They are to be taught to pray, to abhor sin, to fear God, and to obey the Lord Jesus Christ; and when they come to years of discretion, if they are free from scandal, appear sober and steady, and to have sufficient knowledge to discern the Lord's body, they ought to be informed it is their duty and their privilege to come to the Lord's Supper." (*Directory of Worship*, chap. 9, sec. 1.) "All baptized persons are members of the Church, are under its care, and subject to its government and discipline; and when they have arrived at the years of discretion, they

are bound to perform all the duties of Church members." (*Discipline*, chap. 1, sec. 6.)

A clear statement of the opposite view of the case may be found in the following, from a Baptist author, Rev. Henry C. Fish, D. D., and pastor of the First Baptist church, Newark, N. J.: "It will be seen that something more than a little water divides us from those whom we yet love as Christians. It is a difference upon the radical question as to who shall be received to baptism and acknowledged as members of Christ's church. We may say, believers; they, believers and their unbelieving children. We cannot walk in church fellowship with those who thus persist in modelling the Christian church after the Hebrew commonwealth, instead of the pattern given in the New Testament. We must, for the truth's sake, continue to protest against so grave an error." (*Madison Avenue Lectures*, p. 50.)

Of all the questions of theology there are none so apparently befogged with error as this of infant church membership, so that I wish to present, if possible, a clear statement of what to me appears to be the teachings of God's word upon this important subject. First, then, in criticizing the latter quotation, I would say that the Jewish commonwealth was not the Christian church, but a type of the Christian church. This is taught by Baptist theologians, as well as those of other denominations. Prof. William C. Wilkinson, of the Baptist Theological Seminary, of Rochester, N. Y., says: "Ancient Israel was a type of the Christian church. *A type*, let it be remarked, for ancient Israel *was not*

the Christian church. It was the Christian church's type." He then goes on to show how the Jewish nation was the descendants of Abraham, sealed in infancy by circumcision, and that the Christian church is composed of Abraham's spiritual seed, and are to be baptized, not in natural infancy, but in their spiritual infancy, or immediately after conversion. A very ingenious argument, I admit, but one which I cannot accept as the truth, from the very fact that the analogy throughout does not hold good, but is broken and defective. A sound green orange is a perfect type of a ripe orange, but a partially rotten and worm-eaten green orange cannot be a type of a good ripe one. If there is a defect in the type, there must be a corresponding defect in the antitype. A nation, part of which falls from God's favor, cannot be a type of a sanctified church which does not fall from His favor. The antitype, then, must cover something more than a church of purely sanctified believers. Paul says "they were not all Israel that were of Israel." The nation was virtually rotten at the core. The whole history of the Old Testament was a history of falling from grace, and in the end we find almost the entire nation plunging itself in irretrievable ruin by rejecting their Messiah, crucifying David's anointed Son, and persistently rebelling against the authority of the Roman empire. Still, out of this corruption, Paul declares that there is a *remnant* which shall be saved. The grace, then, from which they fell was not the grace of the sanctified, nor a type of it, but the blessings of the visible kingdom—in the antitype

the blessings of God's word taught in infancy. Israel, then, was not a type of the regenerated church which cannot fall from grace, but a clear, well defined, and unmistakable type of those who are born within the limits of the visible kingdom, our baptized children, as well as an inner sanctuary of sanctified believers—a chosen priesthood.

The Christian Church, then, consists of, 1st, a spiritual priesthood of regenerated believers—teachers—dispensing, by life and example, as well as in other ways, the word to others; 2nd, their baptized children, scholars, or disciples, learning the word for their own benefit.

Now, I believe in having a purely spiritual church of none but regenerated believers, as much so as any Baptist brother can do. None should be admitted but those who give satisfactory evidence of regeneration. Not a mere resolve, or even a determination to follow Christ, as the prodigal when he came to himself, but when clothed with a change of garments, and seated at his father's table partaking of the spiritual feast. Neither of those two brothers were of Abraham's spiritual seed, until they had changed their garments and partaken of the symbol of their freedom from the bondage of the law. But, then, to this church belongs a court, a subordinate department, who are not yet partakers of the Lord's Supper, but whose symbol of entrance is baptism; water —the word—washing away the dust of the field, instructing and preparing for entrance into a higher sphere. To these spiritual infants, who have entered the court, the Lord's Supper is to be administered.

Baptism belongs to a condition much more carnal than this spiritual birth, although not a national symbol like circumcision, yet confirming the child's position in the New Testament Israel, but not into the spiritual priesthood, or invisible kingdom of Christ.

It will be observed, that in the case of the prodigal and his brother both were born in the same house, both sat at the same table, and received their nourishment from the same hand; both had been clothed by the same provident care, and both had imbibed the same lessons of instruction; but one wandered away, repented, and came back again, while the other remained faithful to his father, never leaving or forsaking him. The Greek word for repentance—μετανοεω—means a *change of mind*. This change of mind occurred in the prodigal when he turned away with loathing and abhorrence from his filthy condition, longing for a pure and holy life. His repentance led to his conversion. To convert is *to turn back again*, and is from the Latin "con" *again*, and "vertere" to *turn*. This repenting and converting influence the elder brother had never experienced—could not experience in order to turn back again to his father's house.

The general impression is, that children of believers (as well as all others) are born in the world, and belong to Satan until they are converted. It is not understood that they are members of the church, but of Satan's kingdom, until converted, when they become members of Christ's Church. Language to that effect is to be found continually in our religious

periodicals. I copy one from an article in the *Herald and Presbyter*, now before me, entitled "Peril of Delay." It says: "The late Dr. Spencer, of Brooklyn, N. Y., author of 'Pastor's Sketches,' made a personal inquiry how old each member of his church was when converted. He had two hundred and fifty-three members. The following was the result: one hundred and thirty-eight were converted under twenty years, and eighty-five between twenty and thirty, etc. * * * * According to the investigation of Dr. Spencer's church—and a like proportion has been found in other evangelical churches—more than half his members were converted before twenty years of age, so that, by this reckoning, for children who are not regenerated before that time in life, half the probabilities are gone that they ever will be. * * * * Certainly this is something that should enlist the deepest parental solicitude for unconverted children, and of Sabbath-school teachers for their scholars." The children here referred to were members of the Sabbath-school, consequently baptized children, who were precisely in the condition of the elder brother. They had never gone astray, consequently could not come back again by repentance, in the sense of coming back again from the world. It is impossible to tell when the germ of eternal life is implanted in the heart of the child; it may be in early infancy, as in the cases of Samuel, Jeremiah, John the Baptist, and of Timothy. It is not at all times accompanied with outward visible manifestations, and may be even so gentle that the possessor himself may not be aware of its presence.

Both the elect and non-elect child may occupy precisely the relation to the Father that this elder brother did, until some unexpected event, like that of a filthy tender of swine entering the family circle, and overturning every sense of propriety and decency according to their ideas, and they are called upon to re-examine and see whether they had imbibed the right meaning from their father's teaching or not.

The following from the *Christian Observer*, of Louisville, for January 14th, 1880, is to the point, and states the doctrines of the Presbyterian Church on this subject: "Our system (the Presbyterian) receives its private members, not as masters and judges in the Lord's house, but only as scholars and learners. It does not receive them as regenerate, but only as making a credible profession of faith. It tells them who wish to join that it expects them to go on improving year after year, and that it does not esteem any mortals perfect. In these respects it is unpopular."

Remember that the two sons in the parable, on the one hand, were separated from the heathen world by an immense gulf, and on the other by a wall which divided them from the priestly office; and just in the same way the children of truly regenerated believers to-day are separated from the unbelieving and rebellious outside world by a gulf wider than the Atlantic; yet on the other hand, there is a dividing wall which separates them from a place in the sanctified Church. Many, when they arrive at the point where the prodigal was when he "came to himself," and resolved to go to his father, feel very

happy, but their happiness is based on their own good resolutions, and they mistake these for regeneration. But the work of the Spirit may be only exterior, and they may fall by the way. Not until they have suffered the death of the old man—the carnal nature—symbolized by the death of the fatted calf, and have partaken of the new, in the feast within the Father's sheltering roof, are they assured that the Spirit's work is not external, but internal.

And now let us ask an important and solemn question, Why did Christ establish a Church on earth, if it were not for the benefit of His children? Did He command His apostles to go and baptize none but a spiritual priesthood—none but teachers in the sanctuary? Or did He command them to baptize disciples? Baptist authors occasionally, without knowing the truth they proclaim, tell us that Christ commanded His apostles to "disciple the nations, baptizing them." That is right; and when they have discipled, God will choose from among those disciples a spiritual priesthood of regenerated believers. But children of believers are born into a state of discipleship. The infant, from the first dawn of reason, is a disciple taught by the movements of its mother's finger. Water baptism is a symbol of this continued teaching which confirms his birthright. It is born a disciple, and a disciple it remains, until, knowing the Christ, he receives or rejects Him. The true baptism of the soul—the gospel teaching, is what confirms his discipleship.

The establishment of a church for the exclusive benefit of truly regenerated believers is too selfish to

be from Christ. Such a church would be virtually a church of Pharisees, claiming for themselves all the benefits derived from the spiritual sonship of Abraham, to the exclusion of all publicans, however attentively they may sit at the feet of Jesus. A church of exclusive regenerated believers God does not want. God does not want us to sit at His table in the spiritual sanctuary, and eat of the sacrifice offerings and shew bread, and enjoy ourselves. Our field of labor is the court, where we are to train the cadet, and fit him for a soldier; and when thus trained we will both go out to the conquest of the world. *What God does want* is that we should *labor* in his vineyard, and that vineyard is the antitype of ancient Israel—those who are born in the visible kingdom, including all the young and tender plants which it is our duty to cultivate and nourish. Here again we observe another important point. It is only the child of Abraham that can become a prodigal. The child of a pagan could not become a prodigal. He is born in Satan's kingdom, away from all teachings. His food has been swine's food from the beginning, and he knows no other, consequently he is satisfied with it. Should he die in infancy he is saved, not through any covenant made with Abraham, either carnal or spiritual, but through the covenant of redemption made between the Father and Son in the councils of eternity.

Before leaving the case of the prodigal, it may be well to note for future meditation, an analogy which we find running through the four stages of the prodigal's experience, and the opening of the first four

seals in Revelation: 1st, The prodigal's chafing under a father's restraint, and the arrow of the bow of the conquerer bringing conviction to the sinner's heart; 2nd, That conviction becomes a "sharp sword," bringing the prodigal into suffering and misery; 3rd, A famine in the land, in which the prodigal is humbled, and receives the advice of John the Baptist, to render justice in all his dealings with his fellow man, (Luke iii. 11–14); 4th, Regeneration —life out of death (a *green* horse—erroneously translated pale—being a symbol of regeneration)—sanctification. The prodigal returns and is reconciled.

DID THE ELDER BROTHER REPENT?

In presenting these views, the question has often been asked me, Did not the elder son have to repent just as much as the younger son did? I have invariably answered in the negative; but the question is repeated again and again, and an answer imperatively demanded. I can only answer as heretofore: *No!* I say, No!! Emphatically, NO!!! But I ask no one to believe me. Believe God's Word. Paul says, "Let God be true, but every man a liar." If, then, the statement does not conform with something seen within the limits of our little horizon, we may take it for granted that the defect is in our vision, and not in God's Word. The urgency with which this question is asked and repeated convinces me of the difficulty of rooting up old errors when

once they have thoroughly gotten possession of the mind. They are like noxious weeds, which you may dig up and root out, and next summer they are as prolific as ever.

God's word is decisive on this point, and affords no room for cavil. It says that "the ninety and nine just persons need *no* repentance." God again, through the father of the prodigal, confirms the declaration when he says to the elder brother, "Son, thou art ever with me, and all that I have is thine."

To say that these ninety and nine just persons were angels or redeemed spirits, is only adding error to error; for our Lord explicitly declares that they were the flock in the wilderness; that is, just where the lost sheep was before it went astray. You may ask, "Did not this son sin daily, and does not every violation of the law condemn to death—death eternal, unless repented of?" Yes, I grant it. Put it in the strongest language that you possibly can. Bring to bear upon it all the light you can possibly obtain from the Scriptures, and I accept it as Bible doctrine, and hope ever to be faithful to it as I have in the past. But this has absolutely nothing to do with the question before us. The error undoubtedly grows out of a misunderstanding of the design and extent of the parables. We accustom ourselves to interpret these parables according to our condition, our customs, our practice in our houses, and at our dinner tables, rather than those of the Jews in our Savior's time. And now that so many books of travel in Palestine, treating of its customs and the habits of the people, both in modern and

ancient times, are being constantly published and sold so cheap, we ought certainly to be more enlightened on these subjects.

Let us, then, see how a Jew, familiar with the customs of his people and their significance, would look upon this parable in Christ's time. The elder brother remained at home. This implies that he kept himself ceremonially pure, and away from contact with the impure world, or in other words, every day's account was settled, paid, and squared-up before the sun went down. He would by no means be allowed to partake of the evening meal until he had laid aside his sandals, and washed his feet at the door. The father would not permit his son to pass through the door until he had washed his feet. It was a religious ceremony that could not be dispensed with, and implied that all his daily transgressions were forgiven—washed away.

The father's explicit declaration, "Son, thou art ever with me," proves beyond the shadow of a doubt that all daily sins were accounted for, and squared up by the father's kiss of reconciliation every night, and this had been done from his earliest infancy up to the present time. Laboring in the field as he did, it was impossible for him not to return without soiled garments; but these were very different in the eyes of a Jew from the filthy garments of the tender of swine, and were cleansed by the Jewish purifications, and these daily lustrations of the Jews symbolized a daily cleansing from sin.

Such being the case, his daily debts were paid, and were not to be taken into the account. They

were paid from the daily cash-book out of the daily fund, and were not transferred to the ledger to accumulate day after day against him, and then be paid by a draft on the bank. To demand payment from the bank for a debt already cancelled and squared up in the cash-book, a clear balance having been already struck, would be considered wrong, unjust, and dishonest, consequently our Lord says, "the ninety and nine have no need of repentance."

Those of whom the elder brother was a type are called "just," not because they have not sinned, but because their sins are blotted out—forgiven. The Scriptures are very clear upon this subject: "Blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity, and in whose spirit there is no guile." "I, even I, am He that blotteth out thy transgressions." "Blessed is the man whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered." "I have blotted out as a thick cloud thy transgressions, and as a cloud thy sins," (referring to the morning cloud dispelled by the rising sun in mountainous countries.) All this was spoken by ancient Israel, consequently the child under the antitype of Israel occupies precisely the same place in regard to daily sins that the professed believer in a risen and glorified Saviour does, and is under the same necessity to seek and obtain daily forgiveness. In the fourth of Romans, Paul applies this blessedness, first to Abraham under the old covenant, even before he came under the covenant, and then he applies it to Christians, and clinches the nail by saying, "There is therefore no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus;" and the apostle

John's declaration is still more emphatic: "Whoever abideth in Him sinneth not."

Let us again glance at the Jewish custom of washing the feet before entering the door of a dwelling. On one occasion a company sat by the side of a door soon to be opened, when a son of the father came with a bowl and towel, and commenced washing their feet. One of the company drew back, saying, "Thou shalt never wash my feet." The son answered, "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me." The servant of the law said, "Not my feet only, but my hands and my head." The son responded, "He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit; and *ye are clean*, but not all." One of the company was an apostate. Now these words were spoken to those who were still in the condition of the elder brother,—servants under the law, for they were still under the old dispensation.

I said, "by the side of a door about to be opened." This was the door of the new covenant. Christ is that door. He is the door of the old dispensation, as well as of the new; of the court as well as of the sanctuary; and, looking forward to the future, He is the door of the holy of holies also, for He Himself says, "I am the resurrection and the life."

In the tenth chapter of John, Christ speaks of Himself as the door of the sheep-fold, and He says this to His own disciples, all exclusively Jews, and all under the old dispensation; and then, in one of the very few references He makes to the Gentiles, He says, "And other sheep I have, which are not of this *fold;* these also I must bring, and they shall

hear My voice, and there shall be one *flock* and one shepherd." In the Greek there are two words—αὐλη, *a fold*, and ποιμνη, *a flock*—both of which are used here. The former is applied to the Jewish *fold*, under the old dispensation, hedged in, walled about, by the law, and the other to the Christian *flock*, or Church, out in the open field of active service. The Christian *flock* is in the world, yet Christ is equally the door of both, although one was in a state of apostleship, sent out to declare the kingdom of heaven.

Now, again, observe the language used in describing these "ninety and nine *just* persons." They are called *just* persons. They are not called *holy* persons, for the words translated *holy* and *saints*, used elsewhere in the New Testament, would imply that they belonged to the new covenant. They are called *just* persons, and the Greek word has the same origin as that used by our Lord at His baptism by John: "It becometh us to fulfil all *righteousness*;" or, as some versions have it, "fulfil all *justice*." Now what righteousness could Christ refer to but the righteousness of the Mosaic law—ceremonial righteousness. The word *just* is hardly appropriate here, for justice itself refers more directly to man's relations with his fellowman, while the idea here is man's relation to his God. Notice again, in the same connection, an error in our version which misleads. The father, in speaking to the servant of the law, is represented as saying, "Son, thou art ever with me." This the father could not do, as it would imply that he had passed over into the new dispensation, and been made a partaker of

the liberty—sonship—of the gospel; consequently, when we refer to the Greek we find the word, τεκνον, *child*, and not υἱε, *son*.

Here, then, we clearly distinguish the difference between the two brothers. The elder had no need of repentance or purification. His daily lustrations, performed with a willing mind in the father's presence, cleansed him from daily sins. On the other hand, the filth had been accumulating day after day on the prodigal during the long years of his absence, without a single lustration. During this time he had lived in open rebellion against his father's authority, and this could alone be cancelled by *repentance*—coming back again to his father's house, making confession, and seeking forgiveness—and not by ablutions in a strange land. The elder son, on the other hand, needed *no repentance* for rebelling against a kind father's authority; *no repentance* for turning back upon his just laws; *no repentance* for abandoning his father's home, together with all the endearments of childhood, squandering his patrimony, living with harlots, entering the service of a polluted Gentile, feeding swine, the abomination of the Jew; walking with defiled and tattered garments in the very lowest depths of degradation and pollution.

Up to the night when the prodigal returned, the elder brother had never failed to pass through his father's door, and that door is Christ. *He belonged to the family of the justified, but not to the sanctified.* Whether on this occasion he yielded to the father's entreaties and passed through that door, or whether he now became a rebel—a prodigal like his brother

—the parable does not tell us. It closes just at that point of history in the life of the Jewish nation when these words were pronounced, and we must look elsewhere for a continuation of the history.

The great mistake appears to be in supposing that the ninety and nine who need no repentance must necessarily be *sanctified* persons, and not *just* persons, as is stated. But when we clearly define the limits of the two dispensations, the whole difficulty disappears. Up to this time but half of the Christian believer's duty had been required of the elder brother —that of a servant—his obedience to his father; and the faithful among the Jews had no doubt, from a human standpoint of vision, complied with this; but now another and a different element is introduced. Heretofore the Jew considered that the law had been given exclusively to himself, and that he was under no obligations to any one who was not like himself a partaker of the blessings and duties of the synagogue. He had complied with the requirements of the first table of the law, and with the second as far as the narrow limits of his own household required. But now he is brought under the second table in a wider and broader sense of obligation than before, as God leads him to see the necessity of observing its requirements in regard to the outside world, hence he is led to inquire, "Who is my neighbor?" and in order to justify himself, settles down to the conclusion that his neighbor is only those who live within his own enclosure. But now God brings to his door a poor, dirty, ragged stranger, from a far country, and what will he do with him? Will he

take him in and clothe and feed him, or will he give him only the dogs' portion—the crumbs which fall from his table? Here, then, we have the primary object of the parable. That it was intended to illustrate the return of a penitent sinner is only secondary. The primary object was to teach the Pharisee a lesson in regard to the obligations he was under to his fellowman. This he had overlooked, and this is the basis of the new dispensation. The Pharisee had doubtless felt the obligations he was under to keep the law, but he had established no missionary society, and sent out no missionaries, even to the publicans, much less to the heathen world. But a new era is about to be introduced, in which not love to God alone, but brotherly love, is to be the distinguishing characteristic. The Pharisee now stands without the door, the representative of two distinct classes: 1, Those who from childhood have not only observed the outward requirements of the law, but within whose breasts the Holy Spirit has implanted an inward desire for holiness; and 2, The cold, ostentatious hypocrite, whose only desire is outward holiness and self-gratification. The former may err—they do, and are now in error in regard to their treatment of the wandering brother—but will be convinced by a father's arguments, yield to his entreaties, and go in and partake of the feast, and feeling its efficiency, will exclaim: "We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren." The other class will turn away, treating the wanderer with indifference, or hurling after him anathemas and persecution. These may

possess every other grace, but failing in this one heaven-born gift, all their righteousness, long prayers, devotion, good deeds and faithful works are but "sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal." (1 Cor. xiii. 1.)

It is admitted there may be a few who, like Timothy and John the Baptist, may remain faithful to the teachings of their parents from early infancy, but it is said that "they are so very few that it is dangerous to teach such a doctrine." I answer, very well. Supposing there are but few, say only five, on the whole face of the earth, these are enough to sustain the doctrine. But I must deny that there are a few. On the contrary, there are not a few, but many. Hundreds of declarations of Scripture prove that there are many. All the faithful Jews who died before Christ's resurrection were of this class; and if there is a perfect analogy between the type and antitype, there must be just as many faithful children in proportion to the whole of the children of the church to-day as there were faithful Jews in proportion to the whole family of Israel before Christ came. The declaration that there were "seven thousand in Israel," even at its lowest ebb, ought to suffice us. If such was the case in Ahab's time, how many are there to-day in God's Israel who are faithful, yet not professed members of Christ's church? But the doctrine is Bible doctrine, and it cannot be dangerous to teach it. The doctrine is Presbyterian doctrine, and the ministers of the Presbyterian church are under solemn obligations to sustain it. As a minister of God's word in connection with the Presby-

terian church, my conscience compels me to teach it.

On the other hand, it is dangerous not to teach this doctrine. That it is a dangerous doctrine, and should not be taught, like every other error, is a device of Satan to ruin souls. Thousands of faithful children are taught that, instead of making a profession of faith in Christ, they must first pass through some wonderful change, like that which befell Paul on his way to Damascus; that a supernatural revelation must be given to them, and they are impelled to wait year after year for this supernatural change, until they become cold and wander away like the prodigal, and are lost. By all means let us have the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

Again, the number of those in the outward visible kingdom of Christ—that *remnant* which will be finally saved—of those who have not come up to the standard of sanctification according to the New Testament, by which they are made servants of the law, are not a few. It comprises pretty much all who will be saved where the Greek and Roman Catholic churches prevail; but there may be many even among Protestant denominations. A profession of faith in Christ does not change the heart. The germ of eternal life may be implanted in the heart, and yet never be brought to such maturity in this life as to distinguish its possessor from his fellow disciple in the temple court, yet God will not allow it to perish, but bring it to maturity in the world to come; while again, others may, whether possessing the inward

germ or not, have such outward manifestations of the Spirit as to suppose they belong to the regenerated church, and making a profession of faith in Christ, appear for a time as bright and shining lights, and then sink into a state of coldness and indifference, and hang on year after year as dead weights to the church, and finally perish in the world, or die within the church as professed believers, yet never having risen above the standard of an Old Testament Pharisee.

Such passages as, "They went out from us because they were not of us," are quoted to refute the views here presented, but they are all foreign to the subject. Instead of refuting these views, they only prove them. They went *from* us, while we were yet in the court; disciples, but they were not *of us* who are sanctified. There is no evidence that the Holy Spirit had commenced a work within them, although He may have bestowed upon them outward blessings, by which they were faithful disciples for the time being. Judas may have been of this class, and so also "Antichrist," whom the apostle names as the one who "went out from us." Antichrist was a false teacher, who may have been a faithful servant under the old dispensation, like the prodigal son while he remained in his father's house; but he never belonged to the church of regenerated believers, consequently could not be of them. He went out from the kingdom of the world, of which he may have been a faithful member, but was never a member of the kingdom of the Spirit, and as such he is a fallen messenger (angel). To quote this pas-

sage, then, to prove that all children belong to the kingdom of Satan until they are converted and join the sanctified church, is a manifest perversion of Scripture. Paul's language on this point is decisive, and admits of no room for controversy: "The heir, as long as he is a child, differeth in nothing from a servant." An almost universal opinion is, that the children of believers are, like the outside world, born and trained in Satan's kingdom, until, by some miraculous interposition, they are suddenly converted and become children of God. I read a statement lately, in a religious periodical, that "the Bible knows of no intermediate state between justification and sanctification." Such views are perfectly erroneous. The implanting of a spiritual germ under the old economy may be a sudden transit from death to life, but that sanctification is an instantaneous work is nowhere taught in God's word. In the case of the prodigal, a long, tedious journey had to be accomplished before he could return from that "far country" to his own beloved home; many a weary mile had to be measured by his steps before he could see his father's roof. It was a long journey, through a burning desert, which took Israel forty years to pass over; worn and footsore, a remnant arrived safe, while many fell by the way. Dr. Timothy Dwight's language on this subject is to the point. He says that it is "unscriptural, deceitful, dangerous." Until a tree bears fruit it produces nothing but leaves, and yet it may have all the elements of a good tree in a state of development. It was engrafted by the gardener when quite small, and yet

through long years there is nothing but growth and useless leaves. When it arrives at maturity it enters upon a new era, and fruit is produced. This era was to the Jewish nation the coming of Christ. Up to that time the nation had not sent out a single missionary or made a single convert. After this period the grafted portion produced fruit, and the remainder was cut off, lost, or scattered. The same may be said of the child of the believer. That new era is sanctification—when he begins to produce fruit. He may have been grafted by the Divine gardener in early infancy, before his recollection; or it may have come to him as it did to the prodigal, in his wanderings far away from the fold. From the grafting to the fruit-bearing a long space may intervene. A child of Satan to-day, and a child of God to-morrow, is no doctrine of Christianity. They must serve under the law before they can be sanctified by Christ.

THE UNRIGHTEOUS STEWARD.

LUKE XVI. 1–9.

THE parable of the unjust steward has always been considered the most difficult of all the parables, and one which has led to more different interpretations than any other. The different meanings assigned to this parable would fill a volume. That God should commend a servant for an act of injustice puzzles the commentators, and has led them to

exhaust their ingenuity in devising some means to reconcile the discrepancy. Alford says: "This parable is about a child of this present world, and when applied to a child of light all that pertains to the child of the world is to be dropped out of sight, and only that retained which refers to the children of light." This is not satisfactory. There must be a perfect analogy between the type and antitype, or we may rest assured that we have not yet obtained the true interpretation. All difficulty, however, vanishes if we take the parable in its proper connection in our Lord's discourse with the parables which precede and follow it.

The direct application of the parable was to the faithful Jews at our Saviour's time, in regard to their relations with the Roman empire, and beyond, to Christians in their use of the good things belonging to this world.

"*And He said also to His disciples.*" He now ceases for a moment to direct His discourse to the whole audience, and turns to His disciples, who may have occupied a position somewhat separate from the main company, and probably in a lower tone, yet within distinct hearing of the whole audience, relates the following parable. This was done, no doubt, to show them that it was something which directly concerned their own welfare, but from the interest of which the Pharisees were not altogether excluded.

Christ had a double object in view in presenting this parable to His disciples. One was, to teach them to so use the goods of this world that they

might have treasure in heaven; and the other was a sort of warning as to what they should do when Jerusalem would be destroyed by the Romans. I am led to this conclusion by the extraordinary efforts which Josephus and his friends made to persuade the Jews to conciliate the Romans, and thus save themselves from utter destruction—advice which they rejected, but which had already been accepted by the Christians as a precaution from our Lord, none of whom were found fighting against the Romans.

The rich man was God. The steward was the child of the synagogue. The riches were no doubt worldly riches. The silver and gold belong to God, although He wisely, for the time being, allows the Roman empire to put her stamp on His coin. I think, however, spiritual riches were included, as the main object of the parable appears to be to teach the Jew of that time (as well as the Christian Church in future ages) man's duty to man.

"*And the same was accused unto him, that he had wasted his goods.*" Some suppose that this was a slanderous accusation, but there is no proof that it was. If it had been, the steward would certainly have taken some measures to have proved his innocence. But he makes no attempt whatever to defend himself. The course that he pursues indicates that there could be no doubt about his guilt. He was precisely in the same position that the ceremonially righteous Jew was in at the time of our Saviour. He had received all the blessings that had come to him by being God's chosen people—the law and the prophets, as well as temporal blessings—

and all these he had squandered upon himself. He had eaten them up, and worn them ont, and now they are gone. He here again shows his true character, an idolater bowing at the feet of the great idol, *Self*. He had done nothing for the benefit of his fellow-brother of the seed of Abraham, the publican, much less the Samaritan and Gentile. He had expended all upon himself, entirely oblivious of the existence of a brother with whom he was under obligations to share every penny.

And now, rising into the higher sphere, that of the antitype, we find that we in like manner, when brought face to face with God's law, must acknowledge ourselves guilty. We cannot answer for one of a thousand sins. We have squandered our precious time; we have trespassed upon God's goodness; we have spent upon ourselves, in the enjoyment of earthly pleasures, that which we should have shared with others; and now we find that there is no soundness in us. "All we like sheep have gone astray."

"*Give an account of thy stewardship, for thou mayest be no longer steward.*" The devout Israelite of that time was fully warned. The kingdom was about to be taken away from them and given to others. The old discipline was about to close. Old Testament prophecy had foretold the time, and it was about to close. The end of the age was near at hand, and the stewards of Israel were about to be called upon to render up an account of their stewardship. We, in the antitype, are in the same condition. Life is fast passing away, and soon we will be

called to give an account of our stewardship, and pass out into the eternal future.

"*What shall I do?*" says the unjust steward; "*I cannot dig, and I am ashamed to beg.*" And what shall *we* do? Without God's assistance and protection we can do nothing. We cannot keep ourselves from the grave. We have no power to preserve life in these decaying bodies. What shall we do? We are about to be turned out of our stewardship. The hour of death is fast approaching, when this mortal life shall cease. What shall we do? We cannot raise ourselves from the grave. We cannot dig. What shall we do?

And he says, "*I am ashamed to beg.*" There is the great difficulty. Whom shall we beg from? Who alone can help us but God? But it is His goods we have wasted, and shall we go to Him whom we have wronged and beg of Him? Here is just where the shame becomes a prominent factor. And it is worse to go to our fellowmen and beg of them, for they are all in the same condition that we are in, and unable to help themselves. What shall we do? for the cold night of death cometh, when we can neither work nor beg. What shall we do?

"*So he called every one of his lord's debtors.*" The unjust steward has resolved what to do. Heretofore he has lived for self, and for self alone, and consequently has no friends among the lord's debtors. He is alone in the world. He now resolves that, during the short time that remains of his stewardship, he will gain the good will of his lord's debtors, by bestowing upon them those goods which he had here-

tofore wasted upon himself. His resolution was no sooner matured than put into practice. We are not told how many there were; there may have been fifty, or there may have been five hundred. Only two examples are given us, to show how he treated them all; just as three examples are given in the parable of the pounds, and ten servants, to show how all were treated, varying in this case (as was done in that to the several abilities of the servants) according to the indebtedness of each, as well as to the amount of benefit he supposed that he should reap from each one in return for his kindness.

Now, there is no indication whatever that this transaction was done *secretly*. There was no effort made to conceal it. It was public—open to the gaze of the whole world. The steward's character is already gone, and he knew that what he did would be binding upon his lord; but no matter, he does not care what he thinks of him now.

In applying the parable to the condition of the Jew, we now find that the figure changes, and instead of the Pharisee, who heretofore had lived alone for himself, altogether unconscious of any obligations he was under to the outside world, he now becomes the publican, conciliating the Romans by gathering their taxes from his own people, and paying them over to them. He now seeks to make friends with the Roman government, that when his own nationality shall have been blotted out, he may have a treasure and a habitation that will endure; and when applied to us, we are brought face to face with our obligations to our fellowmen, in not only dealing

honestly with them, in sharing with them all divine blessings, both temporal and spiritual, but using our goods in bringing them into ways that lead to purity and holiness.

"*And the lord commended the unjust steward, because he had done wisely.*" Here is the great difficulty. "Why should his lord commend him for doing that which is manifestly unjust, and was undoubtedly an act of dishonesty toward himself? Before answering this question, I would suggest a substitution of the word *prudently* for the word "wisely." He acted *prudently;* and now I would say that his lord did not commend his honesty, but his prudence. The latter clause of the verse confirms this: "The children of this world are wiser (or more prudent) than the children of light."

Now, again, we must take into consideration the position held by a steward in an oriental kingdom. The goods were consigned to him, just as our Lord consigns earthly treasures to us, to make what use of them we think proper, so that we may advance His interests. Out of this we are allowed our own living,—all our daily expenses; the balance belongs to Him. This case is similar to the parable of the ten talents. The ten talents gained by one, and two by another, were promptly handed over by the servants who had gained these sums. This steward, instead of laying up for the master, had *eaten up* for himself. He appears to have laid up nothing for himself. If he had laid up for himself, it would have been all right, as he himself belonged to his lord, and consequently all he possessed belonged to

him also. And now I think the dishonesty of the transaction with his fellowmen will disappear, if we take into consideration the position which the typical steward held at this time in the kingdom of Israel. All Israel were servants of the law. The steward (or prophet) was also a servant, but a dispenser of his lord's goods among his fellow servants. John the Baptist was the greatest of the stewards of the old dispensation; but unlike this steward, John lived an abstemious life, while this one squandered his lord's goods in personal enjoyment. His true legitimate occupation, then, was to share the goods his lord had consigned to him with his fellow servants, as each one had need, consequently his generosity as a publican was to be commended, while his selfishness as a Pharisee was to be as strongly condemned. He is called, then, an "unjust steward," not, as is usually supposed, by what he did after his conversion, but for what he had done before that period. Before, he had lived unjustly in eating up his lord's goods; but now, during the short time that remains, he lives justly, in dividing with his fellow servants that which had been entrusted to him as a steward for that very purpose, thereby gaining friends to his lord's kingdom as well as to himself.

"*Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness.*" Here is another difficulty. What is the meaning of the word *mammon?*—(found also in Matt. vi. 24.) Some have supposed that it was a Syrian name for the god Plutus, the god of riches; but of this there is no proof. We can easily understand by the conversation that it refers to the riches

of this world; but why should Christ say to His disciples, "Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness?"

The word *mammon* does not appear to apply alone to Roman gold, but to that which it represents—worldly happiness and prosperity—and appears to be of ancient origin, carrying our minds back to ancient Babylon, the type of worldly enjoyments and pleasures, and whose symbol was a woman with a golden wine cup in her hand—"the mother of harlots." The word "mammon" is feminine, and appears to have been derived from a word common to all languages, *mama*. The termination *on* enlarges the conception into great, or shameless. As all worldly pomp, splendor, riches and pleasures symbolized by Babylon are retained in the more modern symbol, the Roman empire, the term *mammon*—mother of unrighteousness—is a very appropriate name for the golden coin which represents that empire, and the love of which, then as now, is the motive power that rules the world.

Now, when Christ tells His disciples to make friends of the mammon of unrighteousness, He does not mean that they should place their affections upon riches here, and eat them up, as the Pharisee had done, but rather the reverse, as He told the rich young man, "Go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven." These treasures in heaven come to us through the friends who are to receive us "into everlasting habitations."

Again, remember that at this time the disciples

were still under the old dispensation. Deeds of mercy and charity would be valuable friends when they should be turned out of their stewardship, and these, although done with the Lord's money, would bring a return of a hundred per cent. interest, and although visibly done to men, would be considered as done to Himself; as Christ Himself says, "Then shall the King say unto them on His right hand, Come, ye blessed of My Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. For I was an hungered, and ye gave Me meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave Me drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me in; naked, and ye clothed Me; I was sick, and ye visited Me; I was in prison, and ye came unto Me. Then shall the righteous answer Him, saying, Lord, when saw we Thee an hungered, and fed Thee? or thirsty, and gave Thee drink? When saw we Thee a stranger, and took Thee in? or naked, and clothed Thee? Or when saw we Thee sick, or in prison, and came unto Thee? And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto the least of these, ye have done it unto Me."

"When ye fail" means no more than the hour of death. When this earthly life fails.

"That they may receive you" is understood by many to refer, not to the friends benefited by a proper use of the riches entrusted to our care, but to the "treasure in heaven," purchased by a proper use of unrighteous mammon.

They say that "the *they* is predicated of the heavenly treasure, and not of the *friends*." I hardly think

that the *they* should be thus limited. The unjust steward was not alone received by the treasure which he had bestowed upon his friends, but by the friends themselves, for the benefits received in times past. If by a proper use of our stewardship—our riches—we convert enemies into friends of Christ, these friends, with Him, will receive us into everlasting habitations.

"*He that is faithful in that which is least is faithful also in that which is much.*" We are commanded here to be faithful in the proper use of earthly treasures. If we have not been faithful with them, who will entrust to us the "true riches?" I understand by the *true riches* here, not the "treasure in heaven," purchased by a proper use of earthly riches, good works, etc., and already spoken of, but something still higher, and beyond and without which we cannot enjoy the other. The true riches are Christ Himself, and having Him, our good works will follow us.

"*No servant can serve two masters.*" "*Ye cannot serve God and mammon.*" We learn from this, the use that we are to make of this world's goods. We are to use them as a servant, but not to serve them as a lord or master. The same may be said of riches that we say of fire: "*A good servant, but a hard master.*" We clearly see, then, in this parable a warning from Christ to His disciples to so far conciliate the Roman power as to gain them as friends, but not to bow to them as lords; and secondly, a warning to us to so use the blessings of this life that instead of allowing them to become our masters and

our God, we are to procure for ourselves friends with them, by using them for the conversion and instruction of sinners, that when we pass from earth we shall possess the blessed companionship of these friends eternally in the heavens.

Then, again, we are to make friends in this world who will accompany us on the way to heaven; and in order to do this we must labor for the good of the world; spend our time, talents, money, and energy for the good of the world. This was foreshadowed in Jeremiah's prophecy to the captives in Babylon (the great type of the world), in which the Lord commands them to "Build houses and dwell in them; and plant gardens and eat of the fruit of them; take wives, etc." (Jer. xxix.) This is a parallel case to this warning and command given by Christ to His followers. Strange to say, the Jews of that time, actuated by the same Pharisaical spirit as ruled them in Christ's time, as well as now, commanded Jeremiah to be cast into prison.

THE RICH MAN AND LAZARUS.

LUKE xvi. 14–31.

THE parable of the rich man and Lazarus has an intimate connection with that of the unjust steward, and is only separated from it by a slight reference to the law, *apparently* of another nature, or in other words treating of another subject entirely foreign to the discourse, but which upon examination will be

found to be but an explanation of the same subject, and connecting both parables in one continuous discourse.

"*The Pharisees, who were covetous, heard all these things, and they derided Him.*" It has been denied that the character of the rich man in this parable could be applied to the Pharisees, as they did not squander their wealth in eating and drinking, as the Saducees did, but rather hoarded it up. They fasted often, made long prayers, and were very abstemious; still they were *covetous*, and covetousness means self-enjoyment, even should it be but that of the miser in counting over and over again his piles of money, amid squalid filth and poverty. The following verse explains this: "And He said unto them, Ye are they which justify yourselves before men; but God knoweth your hearts; for that which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God." It was but in outward appearance that they were abstemious—only to please men; and so we are told elsewhere that they disfigured their faces. But does not the covetousness expressed here refer to their condition as a nation, desiring to get all they could out of the Gentiles for national aggrandizement, and not merely for individual enjoyment? Was not this the reason why they so hated to pay tribute to Cæsar, and so despised the tax gatherers or publicans? They did not believe that their nation was to be destroyed, and they turned out of the stewardship. On the contrary, they were in daily expectation of a miraculous interposition from heaven—the Messiah, who would destroy the Roman yoke, es-

tablish them in a kingdom, and bring the wealth of the Gentiles, and lay it at their feet. Therefore, they derided our Lord when He intimated that they should be turned out of the stewardship.

"*And He said unto them.*" Our Lord now turns His whole attention to the Pharisees.

"*The law and the prophets were until John.*" The law and the prophets were a foreshadowing of the kingdom. They are not the kingdom of God in its plenitude. The kingdom of Israel was no more the spiritual kingdom of God than a painting representing cavalry and infantry is the battle of Waterloo.

"*It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than for one tittle of the law to fail.*" The great end and object of the law must be fulfilled. If the kingdom of God is not established on earth, then the law most certainly must be a failure, and our blessed Lord declares that it would be easier for the heavens and earth to pass away than for such a thing to come to pass.

"*Whosoever putteth away his wife and marrieth another, committeth adultery; and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband, committeth adultery.*" All our commentators, as far as I know, have understood this verse in a literal sense, and to have no connection with the parables which precede it. Many suppose that it has reference to Herod Antipas, whose adultery with his brother Philip's wife the Pharisees had tacitly sanctioned, thus allowing an open breach of that law which Christ came to fulfil; and they supposed the rich man

in the following parable to be Herod himself. I do not believe that there is even the most remote reference to anything of the kind. Herod did not marry a divorced wife, but *seduced a married woman* from her husband. That our Lord, in the very midst of one of the sublimest discourses ever uttered, just at the point where He is about to enter upon the peroration, should thus irrelevantly break away from His subject, and refer to one solitary point in the law, without any connection whatever with His discourse, and then immediately return to His subject with no word of explanation, is simply preposterous. Israel was the chosen spouse of the Lord; she is now divorced. The Lord has rejected her, and will no longer care for her. The Roman empire may take her up for a time, as Greece, Persia, and Babylon had done before, but the marriage is not legal; she has come under the curse of the law, and must be punished, and the punishment which the law demands is death. Adultery under the Mosaic law was punished with death, and not one tittle of that law shall ever fail. Jerusalem, the adulterous city, must be punished—destroyed—even if the Pharisees do deride the idea.

The daughter of a priest, who committed adultery, was to be burned with fire. This was the curse pronounced against Babylon the great. God had repudiated Israel, and she was now about to be destroyed, and He would marry Himself to another; that is, to the coming spiritual kingdom, as John the Baptist had already foretold. But the Pharisees rejected that kingdom, preferring to remain in repudiated Is-

rael, although God had warned them by the prophet Isaiah, saying, "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers in her sins." (Isa. lii. 11.)

"*Now there was a certain rich man.*" Here the *Revised* is an improvement on the King James version. Without the "now," the following paragraph would be disconnected, with it the discourse is continuous.

"*Clothed in purple and fine linen.*" *Purple* was the favorite color of kings. The king's robe was purple. Idols were also clothed in purple, to designate the royal authority of the gods they were supposed to represent. *Fine linen* composed the garment of the high priest, and was indicative of righteousness; so we learn that this man, who lived sumptuously every day, was not only a king, but he was a very pious man also.

"*Fared sumptuously every day.*" Not only on feast and gala days, but every day. He is accused of no crime. Some call him the rich glutton, but the Scriptures accuse him of no such crime. He had broken no law. The only thing that can be said against him is that a poor man lay at his door whose wants were unrelieved.

The name *Lazarus* means *help of God.* "The rich man was not named," Augustine says, "because his name had been blotted from the book of life, while the name of Lazarus still remained there."

"*Desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table.*" The language used here indicates that he did not even get these, at least not in such abundance as to satisfy his hunger.

As the rich man's sumptuous living is described in a few words, so Lazarus' poverty and wretchedness are delineated by a few masterly strokes—*covered with sores, and a companion of dogs.*

Nothing is said about the moral condition of Lazarus. If we descend to this, we lose sight of the great lesson to be taught by the parable. Lazarus was not saved because he was a poor man, nor the rich man cast into hell because he was rich. This is the view taken of this parable when the devil teaches the Bible-class, as he too often does. Each soul is saved or lost according to his inherent merits, and not according to the amount of his worldly possessions, or the want of them. Many an infamous scoundrel has entered a monastery and assumed poverty, only to find himself in the end a companion of the rich man in hell. Abraham was rich, and so was David and Solomon, and even Job in his last days.

"*He was carried by angels.*" He who was before the companion of dogs has now become the companion of angels. He now reposes upon Abraham's bosom at the marriage supper of the Lamb.

"*The rich man also died and was buried.*" We are not told that Lazarus was buried even. His body may have been cast out with his companions, the dogs. They were the only friends he had in life, and may have shared a grave with him. That we are told that the rich man "was buried," Trench, in his admirable work on the parables, calls "a sublime irony." No doubt a splendid funeral was made over him. He was laid in a magnificent tomb, or

mausoleum, his body having first been deposited in a costly sarcophagus, carved out of marble or some valuable stone.

"*In hell he lifted up his eyes.*" What a change! The rich man, whose companions were the rich, is now the companion of devils. His purple robe has now become a garment of tormenting flame (whatever that may mean). His fine linen is now polluted with the filth of damned spirits. His sumptuous fare is now exchanged for ceaseless torment. Oh! how gladly would he have exchanged his present position for the hard, stony steps on which Lazarus had lain, his garment for Lazarus' sores, and his companions for Lazarus' friendly dogs.

The sixty-fifth chapter of Isaiah was doubtless intended as a prophecy of the true spiritual character of the selfish Pharisee. He is there first represented as a "rebellious people," polluted by contact with the dead, defiled with unclean food, at heart just the reverse of what his symbolical purity intimated. No doubt our Savior had this passage in His mind when He said: "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outwardly, but are within full of dead men's bones and of all uncleanness."

They say to the publican: "Stand by thyself; come not near to me, for I am holier than thou." But God does not destroy them now, for even corrupt and vile as they are, a select seed—a remnant—the elect, shall come out of them; but when this separation is fully consummated, then a change takes

place. "Therefore," He says, "will I number you to the sword, and ye shall all bow down to the slaughter; because when I called ye did not answer; when I spake, ye did not hear; but did evil before mine eyes, and did choose that wherein I delighted not. Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold, my servants shall eat, but ye shall be hungry; behold, my servants shall drink, but ye shall be thirsty; behold, my servants shall rejoice, but ye shall be ashamed; behold, my servants shall sing for joy of heart, but ye shall cry for sorrow of heart, and shall howl for vexation of spirit."

But right here we are met with a difficulty. The Greek word translated *hell* here is "*Hades*," the place of departed spirits. We are not told that the rich man's *body* went there, nor can any such inference be derived from Scripture, where this word *Hades* occurs. His body, we are told, was buried.

Trench, Alford, and other commentators insist that *Hades* is not hell. Alford says: "*Hades* is the abode of *all disembodied spirits* till the resurrection; not the place of torment, much less *hell*, as understood commonly. Lazarus was also in *Hades*, but separated from Dives; one on the blissful, the other on the baleful side." Again, he says of the *torment:* "Not *eternal condemnation*, for the judgment has not yet taken place; men can only be judged *in the body*, for the deeds done *in the body;* but the *certainty and anticipation* of it." This is far from satisfactory. It does not fulfil the requirements of the language used to describe it: "Send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water and cool

my tongue, for I am tormented in this flame." Does this look like an anticipation of torment, the reality of which, according to Alford, can only come after a judgment that can be verified only after the resurrection of the mortal body united with the soul, and of the result of which we have no reason to suppose he knows anything as yet? According to Alford's view, will this disembodied spirit return to earth, be united with the body, and then in judgment be condemned to a punishment a part of which it has already received? Is this *Hades* a sort of purgatory—a half-way house where souls are tormented between earth and hell?

I believe that the wicked will be punished, and until I can learn from the Scriptures that it is not so, I must believe, for many valid reasons (at least they appear to me to be valid) that that punishment will be eternal; but that the literal body, composed as it is of dissolvable matter, will be raised, to suffer eternally in a hell of literal fire, is not taught in this passage, or in any other in the Bible that I am acquainted with. It was the immortal soul, in this case, that was tormented; and that there will be any change in this torment, such as Alford intimates, from soul to body, after two or more thousand years, is purely assumption.

The subject is certainly attended with difficulties. Gadet, in speaking of *Hades*, says: "*Paradise* as well as *Gehenna* forms part of it." But this is contrary to Rev. xx. 14, where *Hades* is spoken of as being cast into the lake of fire after judgment. The only satisfactory solution I can give to this question

is by supposing that the two characters, the rich man and Lazarus, represent two extreme cases; that the one of Lazarus (*help of God*) had passed out from under the servitude of the law, and by his close communion with God in his poverty, and having believed on Christ, had become a son of God through the gospel, and that consequently, at the hour of the death of his body, he passed into the presence (*parousia*) of Christ, according to John v. 24 and John viii. 51; and that the rich man, on the other hand, having rejected all offers of mercy, living in continual rebellion against God, at the hour of his death, being already condemned (John iii. 13), passes not only into *Hades*, but beyond, and into Gehenna. The Pharisee was a professed teacher in Israel; consequently this man was a false prophet, and entered upon the false prophet's punishment at the hour of death (Rev. xix. 20), and not after a general judgment, as will be the case with others (Rev. xx. 10–14).

I cannot agree with the theory that *Hades* is the abode of all departed spirits. If it were true, then death and *Hades* would be synonymous terms, both meaning the same thing, which we will at once see is not the case if we examine those passages of Scripture where the two words occur in the same connection. They are spoken of as companions, but not as one and the same object. The word *Hades* means *the land of darkness.* Abraham's bosom cannot be in the land of darkness. Christ, addressing the Father at the hour of His death, says by His own mouth, "Into Thy hands I commend My spirit;" and by

the mouth of His prophet, "Thou wilt not leave My soul in *Hades;*" and to the dying thief (now sanctified believer) he says, "To-day thou shalt be with Me in Paradise." To the Jews Abraham's bosom and Paradise were one, but not in the land of darkness, although beyond the range of physical death.

Although in torment, the rich man is recognized by Abraham as a son according to the flesh: "Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receiveth good things. What a fearful meaning there is in this word "*son*" in this connection! Tens of thousands of Roman Catholics believe that they will be saved because they belong to what they believe to be the only true church, and that Protestants will be lost because they do not belong to that church. It was just the same with the Jews in our Savior's time. They believed that they would be saved because they had Abraham for their father. John the Baptist had already told them, "Think not to say within yourselves, "We have Abraham to our father; for I say unto you that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham." They could not believe that a son of Abraham could be lost. They did not know that Abraham himself was a sinner, and could alone be saved by the merits of the sacrifice of Calvary. The rich man was a son of Abraham by the flesh, which means no more than that he was born within the limits of the visible Church, and according to the flesh; that he was in servitude to the flesh, as Abraham's children were to Pharaoh while in Egypt. Abraham must be renounced, and the flesh crucified, hated. Does not this give us a

hint of the meaning of Christ's words, "He that hateth not father or mother cannot be My disciple"? Abraham and the carnal nature must give way to the Christic.

It has been well said that this is the only instance in the Bible of prayer being offered to a dead saint; and I remember once having in my possession a Roman Catholic book, in which this case was quoted as an example of prayer being offered to the saints; but the example has the misfortune of being a witness on the wrong side. The prayer was not answered, and never will be; no, nor any other prayer offered to a departed saint.

The rich man's prayer was not granted. As Lazarus was denied the very crumbs which fell from his table, so now he is denied a single drop of water to cool his parched tongue from the table of his *own* father, Abraham. The Pharisees derided Christ when He told them to make friends of the mammon of unrighteousness, and now He gives them the terrible fate of one who did not do so; not even making a friend of the poor man laid at his own door, he has no friends to receive him "into everlasting habitations." "Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy."

The parable of the unjust steward is so intimately connected with this parable that we cannot separate them without losing the meaning. In thy lifetime I employed thee as a steward over my goods, intending to reward thee at the end of thy stewardship. Thou hast taken thine own reward out of the goods, and now nothing remains for thee. Lazarus made

good use of what he had, however little that may have been, even perhaps not more than to gain the friendship of the dogs that licked his sores, by dividing his crumbs with them. His reward remains to him still intact. The rich man has sown only to the flesh, and of the flesh can reap nothing but corruption, while Lazarus has sown to the Spirit, and of the Spirit reaps life everlasting.

"*Between us and you there is a great gulf fixed.*" The gulf is not only great, but *fixed*. We can well understand how those who are in torment would desire to come out; but we cannot understand why any one should desire to pass to them. Can it be heaven, if we knew that others, created in our likeness, are suffering in torment? If we now have such an intense desire to relieve the sufferings of our fellowmen, will not that desire be increased in a world of sinless purity? Or is the meaning that the gulf is so wide that it can not only *not be bridged* over, so as to pass from one side to the other, but so great that no pulsations of sorrow or of happiness can ever reach across the fathomless abyss that separates the world of joy from the world of torment?

"*Send him to my father's house.*" Finding that no favors would be granted to him, he asks in behalf of his five brethren. And the very request is an insult to Deity; for it is as much as to say, that if God had given him sufficient warning while on earth, he would not now be found in this place of torment. If God had only made His demands clear enough, he would have known. Now he wishes his brethren to have sufficient warning. Abraham's answer is

short and to the point: "They have Moses and the prophets." They have sufficient warning. If they will only make good use of the warning God has given them, they need no more. Who these *five brethren* were, it is not necessary to inquire. They were of the family of Israel, who have Moses and the prophets—probably scribes, priests, Levites, etc.—intimate companions of the Pharisee.

"*If one went to them from the dead they will repent.*" Witness the caviling, contrary spirit of the Pharisee, even amid the torments of the lost. "*Nay, father Abraham.*" On earth they would not believe, continually saying to Christ, "shew us a sign;" and as God's word has told us our works follow us into the other world, and they who are righteous here will be righteous there, and those who are wicked here will be wicked there, we see that the Pharisee still demands a sign,—if one rose from the dead they will *repent.*

"*If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead.*" Father Abraham says they will not even be *persuaded*, let alone repent. "To the law and to the testimony. If they speak not according to this word it is because there is no light in them." The rich man says that they will repent at the return of a spirit from *Hades.* Abraham says they will not be persuaded though one *rose from the dead.* They would not believe God's messengers, although by His power the historical Lazarus rose from the grave, nor would they believe Abraham or Moses or the prophets, when all with one consent told them that

one would rise from the dead who had the keys of death and hell; who told them how and when He should be raised, and what for. In fact, they were told all about it. And when the time came this One did rise from the dead, and sent them His disciples, to warn them of a judgment and future retribution, and *they believed* THEM not. No sign shall be given them but the sign of the prophet Jonas. One who had been three days in the grave arose again, warning them of the future torment of the wicked, but all in vain.

Now the application. The rich man is the proud, legally righteous Pharisee, who had fared sumptuously every day, clothed in purple and fine linen. To him were given the oracles of God, containing all wisdom and all knowledge; the throne of David; the Levitical priesthood; Solomon's temple, with all its symbolical and typical teachings. Everything that could make a people wise and happy had been bestowed upon him. God says: "What could have been done more to My vineyard that I have not done in it?" They were the people that He had made to ride upon the high places of the earth, and to whom pertained the "adoption and the glory and the promises." They boasted of *father* Abraham, and said they were Moses' disciples—God's own chosen people—the elect of heaven, while they considered all other nations as but unclean dogs, and turning their backs upon the Samaritans and publicans, who held a middle ground between the two.

The true God had dwelt among them in a cloud and pillar of fire, and had given His oracles from

the Shekinah of the tabernacle and temple. He had sent them His prophets, and performed in their sight miracles and wonders not even dreamed of by the Gentiles. He had given them a psalmody and spiritual songs unequalled in human language, and had bestowed upon them gold and riches and great honor, and now in these latter days had sent them His own Son, clothed in human flesh, to teach them the way of life.

And what use did they make of all these things?

At their very gate lay not only the Gentile world, but the Samaritan and publican, covered from head to foot "with wounds and bruises and putrifying sores," "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel," companions of dogs, sorcerers, suffering, bleeding, groaning, dying.

And, oh! what did she do, who was crowned with heaven's highest blessings?—she who enjoyed the favor of heaven's high King—she who should have been "a light to lighten the Gentiles"—what did she do to relieve the wants of her poor, suffering, dying sister? To every request of the perishing Gentile she but responded, "It is not meet to take the children's bread and give it to the dogs." She even withheld the crumbs that fell from her table to the publican, shutting him out of the house of instruction by closing the door of the synagogue against him. Oh! if there is not a future retribution for such an inhuman monster, there certainly ought to be.

But the worst is not yet told. Beyond, and still worse, is the story of Jerusalem's degradation. Here

comes one of whom prophecy had said "He shall be great among the Gentiles," one who should "show judgment unto the Gentiles," and of whom it is said "the Gentiles should trust in His name;" or in other words, He should come as a King or representative of the Gentiles. He beholds Jerusalem, and weeps over her, and what does Jerusalem do in return? She calls Him a Samaritan, having a devil; she scourges Him; she spits upon Him; she casts Him out of her gate, mocked with a purple robe, and wearing a crown of thorns; she covers Him with wounds and bruises and putrifying sores, and leaves Him writhing on a cross, bleeding, groaning, dying at her very door; and in the agony of death she gives Him gall and vinegar, and then sends a band of soldiers to break and mangle His dying body, in in order that their holy Sabbath day—Pharisaical ritualism—should not be contaminated. Not Jerusalem, but a band of filthy dogs (as Jerusalem would call them) from Samaria and Galilee sympathize with Him in His sufferings.

And now, the Son of man dies, and goes to the bosom of the eternal Father, a companion of angels. One generation passes, and proud, rich, haughty Jerusalem is surrounded by Roman soldiers. Oh! what a burial! If there was ever a hell on earth, it was there, if there is any truth given in the record as given by her own historian, Josephus. And yet God had warned them through Moses, saying, "I will destroy your high places, and cut down your images, and cast your carcasses upon the carcasses of your idols, and My soul shall abhor you." "I

will smite thee with a consumption and with a fever, and with inflammation, and with an extreme burning, and with the sword, and with blasting, and they shall pursue thee until thou perish." "And the heaven that is over thee shall be brass, and the earth under thee shall be iron." "And thy carcase shall be meat to all the fowls of the air, and unto the beasts of the earth, and no man shall drive them away." "The Lord shall smite thee from the sole of the foot to the crown of the head." "And thou shall become an astonishment, a proverb, and a byword among all nations whither the Lord shall lead thee." (Deut. xxviii.)

Although there is a perfect analogy between the former condition of Jerusalem and her final ruin, as well as of the former condition of the Gentile world without the gospel, and her present condition with it, with the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, yet we must not forget that this is not the object of the parable. The parable finds its perfect fulfilment in persons who were present when Christ pronounced this discourse. The rich man and Lazarus were representative characters, not of the Jew and Gentile world, but of the Pharisee and publican; persons then living within the visible kingdom of Israel, and the death spoken of is not the fate of a nation or nations, but of individuals, a literal death of the body, and the subsequent condition of the soul in a future state. The destruction of Jerusalem is not the antitype, but a corresponding type, on a more enlarged scale; hence the analogy.

APPLICATION.

Dr. Stuart Robinson says of the theory of preaching, that "its purpose is the showing of the people how to read the Word of God, and leading them to feel that this day is the Scripture fulfilled in their ears; and these are the words of Jesus, who not only *spake* by holy men of old, but who is now speaking with living utterances to the men of this generation;" and that in his own preaching he "strove to make the Scriptures a living message from God to men;" translating them into the current forms of thonght and speech. A far too general impression is, that the Bible is a record of events that transpired thousands of years ago, and that its teachings concern the worshippers of false gods in Nineveh or Babylon, and do not definitely concern us who live in Christian lands to-day. This is a sad and fatal error. The Bible is God's message to us personally and individually; and as such we must look for examples of its characters, those persons who act a prominent part among its prophets, priests and kings, as well as those who form the prominent features in its parables and miracles, among living men to-day, if not even in our own hearts. If such is the case, we may be sure to find all the peculiar characteristics of the Pharisee and publican in living men around us, even in our own community, however limited it may be. We have already answered the question as to who the Pharisee and publican were before the preparation of the sacred feast which was to usher in the new dispensation, and of which it is to be hoped

part, by the Father's solicitations, had been induced to partake. Our duty now is, to inquire who are the living men of to-day who bear the same characteristics that the rich man and Lazarus did in our Saviour's time? As has been before remarked, the rich man and Lazarus are by no means the representatives of a rich man and a beggar, upon the sole ground of inequality of real estate or tangible property. The rich man is the representative of an unsanctified soul, rich in this world's goods (either material, moral, and intellectual, or all combined), while Lazarus is the representative of a sanctified soul, rich in faith, but poor in this world's gifts. Either of these individuals may be members of the visible church, or they may not.

We meet with the rich man every day. We not unfrequently find him declaiming in the pulpit. He makes earnest and urgent appeals to sinners to flee from the wrath to come, and threatens them with eternal perdition if they do not come forward and make a profession of Christ. Many say, "What a good man, what an earnest man, what a pious man, behold, what great good he does; how many souls he has brought into the Church." And many are seriously impressed for a time, and are induced to unite with the visible Church; but they soon find that he is a preacher and not a teacher; and instead of feeding them with the bread of life, he feeds them with chaff, and they perish of hunger. (Amos, viii. 11, 12.) Oh! how many come to Him for the bread of life and go away empty. They learn nothing from the pulpit, and turn away to the infidel

teacher, who feeds them on swine's food till they perish. And yet the Pharisee enjoys this position. He may imagine, and doubtless does, that he is doing the Lord's work, and he enjoys it and grows fat in his self-esteem, and in the adulation of his fellow-men. Oh! that the shepherds would feed the flock with the bread of life—God's living word, well-prepared and well-studied—and leave the conversion of souls where it belongs—in the hands of Christ. I would recommend to all such Pharisees to study well the thirty-fourth chapter of Ezekiel, and see what position they occupy in regard to the feeding of God's flock with the pure, unadulterated Word of Life, as it comes from the hands of its Maker, or only a small portion, which they have trodden down with their own feet, soiled and distorted through ignorance of its true meaning.

We find the Pharisaical rich man in the high churchman, who, in his proud sanctimonious ritual, imagines himself to be the only true church, and all "dissenters," who differ from him, to be outside of the fold, and consequently unworthy of his notice.

Again, we find the Pharisee in the very pious officer or member of the church, who, by his very sanctimoniousness and long prayers, repels a wandering brother, or by his coldness and indifference drives him away from the bread of life. Instead of going out and gathering up the filthy Lazarus in his sanctified arms, carrying him in and placing him upon his own soft couch, and calling in a physician to wash and bind up his wounds, he allows him to perish on the hard, stony steps of his mansion; and if he goes

near him at all, it is but to lift his garment in order that he may expose his sores to the eyes of a gaping crowd and denounce his filth, and tattle about his sins. Oh! how many of us would rather talk for hours about the short-comings of our neighbors than teach him a lesson from the way of life. This Pharisee lives altogether for his own glory, within his own piety, and does not share his spiritual blessings with his fellowmen.

We find the Pharisee behind the counter, selling "shoddy" so nicely printed and starched that the unpractised eye cannot distinguish it from the best of first-class goods. He claims that it is "one of the tricks of the trade," which business allows, or rather enforces upon him, regardless of the golden rule, "Do to others as you would have them do to you." In the provision store we find him weighing out glucose—starch boiled in diluted sulphuric acid—and calling it sugar; and oleomargarine, labelled "gilt-edge butter," vainly striving to imagine it all right as long as his customers pay for what they get and do not know the difference. And then, again, we find him in his counting-house settling up with his customers, making thirty three per cent. profit on inferior goods, taking their notes at from twelve to twenty per cent. interest, secured by a mortgage on their property, which he forecloses if his customers should be unable to pay when these notes fall due.

We find him again in that large, splendid establishment where patent medicines are turned out by the million, living sumptuously every day on the vast fortune which he has accumulated, and of which

Lazarus has been robbed under the pretence of curing his sores.

On Sunday he rings a chime of bells to call his family to church, augmenting by their ding-dong the headaches in the hospital opposite; and enjoying a sound, healthy sleep himself at night, is perfectly oblivious to the fact that the dog chained in his back yard for his own protection has by his continual barking deprived his sick neighbor of that necessary rest which would have restored him to health.

He is a politician, seeking for an office which he has not merited, and if successful, he robs his country to supply his own table and fill his own pocket; and if disappointed, seeks revenge by hurling the assassin's bullet at the heart of a President, who, unlike himself, has received office at the hands of a generous people for worthy merit, and refuses to give it to an unworthy miscreant.

He glories in the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, by which he builds to himself a large palace, clothes himself with purple and fine linen, and lives sumptuously at the expense—blood and tears—of widows and orphans, filling the veins of thousands with his vile poison, corroding their bodies and ruining their souls, covering, not only his steps, but filling the gutter even, with the poor, sick and dying Lazarus, whom he refuses to aid even with the crumbs from his table.

A Pharisee may manifest himself in a son or daughter who lives upon a father's generosity without doing anything to repay it; in fact, a wife may be, and alas, far too often is, a Pharisee to her hus-

band, living in genteel idleness while he, poor man, is burdened down with cares, loaded with debts he cannot pay, and struggling with adversity to maintain his family. Every consumer who does not produce an equivalent for that which he consumes is a Pharisee—living at the expense of others. Then, again, every man who plants no orchard, does nothing to build roads or establish schools, or in any other way benefit his country, or tend to the interests of coming generations, is a Pharisee, living for himself alone. The first Pharisee was Cain, and his race will not cease to exist while selfishness remains in the world.

That fine, noble, gentlemanly church member who constantly fills his seat in the pew, and as constantly performs his duty in the Sabbath-school as a teacher of the young, may manifest his Phariseeism by his bad example in leading those who depend upon him for instruction astray from the strict, narrow road of Christian duty and practice. His occasional glass of wine, attendance upon the theatre and other questionable places of amusement, his evening parties, with profane music and dancing, may produce a coldness or lukewarmness in impulsive young hearts, which, in the end, may conduct them down the broad way which leads to the shades of spiritual death. He heeds not the command, "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ."

Thus, wherever we go, whichever way we turn, we find the Pharisaical rich man, living for self, altogether unmindful of the obligations he owes to his

God as his steward, to use for the benefit of His fellowmen those blessings which God has loaned to him for a time, to be employed for this especial purpose. His God is SELF, that great golden calf, which, from his standpoint of vision, is pure gold, but in the eyes of that God who made gold at the beginning, is nothing but the worthless image of a dumb beast. Nor are we always to look for the characteristics of the Pharisaical rich man in those who are blessed with this world's gifts. We may even find some traits of this character in Lazarus, however humble and humiliating his position may appear. The Lazarus which Christ has chosen as an example in this illustration, is a sanctified soul, or he would not have been borne to Abraham's bosom at his death. Not every Lazarus is a sanctified soul. Many are far from being such. It has not unfrequently been the case, that Lazarus has shown himself perfectly destitute of all gratitude, and has proved himself in every way worthy of the hard position he has attained. Not only this but we have known more than once a Lazarus to hurl a good loaf, which had been given him by a rich man, to the dogs because it did not suit his taste, and to heap curses instead of blessings upon the head of his benefactor—preferring the crumbs—a dog's position, to the bread of life. Every Lazarus is willing to relieve a rich man of his "filthy lucre," but not every Lazarus is willing to receive spiritual food and clothing. He prefers the dog's saliva on his sores to the oil of grace, and the hard stony steps to a spiritual

feast of the soul. He also is a Pharisee who lives on the dogs' crumbs rather than submit to divine rule, and live to the glory of his God, by loving his neighbor as he does himself.

CONCLUSION.

LUKE xvii. 1–10.

WE now come to the conclusion of this discourse, which appears to have been intended mainly for disciples, as He again turns His attention to them.

Godet speaks of the "fragmentary character" of these passages, and says: "Luke had, up to this point, related a series of exhortations given by Jesus, the occasion of which he was able to a certain extent to indicate; but he found some in his researches which were mentioned without any historical indication. It is this remnant scrap at the bottom of the portfolio, if I may so speak, which he delivers to us as it was, and without any introduction." I do not like this loose way of treating the discourses of our Lord. Were we dealing with proverbs, we should expect them to possess a "fragmentary character." When Jesus refers to a distinct object within the vision of His audience it is to illustrate His argument, and that gives it a historical connection. Dropping out of sight the illustrative character of these passages we lose sight of the connection, and with it the crowning glory of the discourse vanishes. "It is

impossible but that offences will come; but woe unto him through whom they come." We are here admonished to be very careful not to offend these publicans, who are coming perhaps for the first time, like children—"little ones"—"babes in Christ," to draw their first nourishment from the fountain of life, lest by our Phariseeism we drive them away, and they perish for ever. We are to overlook their weakness, pardon their offences to us, and encourage them to come and be received by, and eat with Christ. It would have been better for us to have been drowned in the depths of the sea than to cause one such soul to perish through our selfishness.

"*If ye had faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye might say unto this sycamine tree, be thou plucked up by the root, and be planted in the sea; and it should obey you.*" The "sycamine tree," referred to here, is probably the male mulberry, a very luxuriant tree, with large green leaves and spreading branches; a beautiful tree to look upon, but which produces no fruit. The prophetical meaning of the word "*sea*" is the *heathen world.* The sycamine tree, then, would represent this great idol, *Self*—a spirit of selfishness, so much admired by its possessors, but which produces no fruit, and is the cause of all the scandals in the Church. Approach almost any one, not a church member, upon the subject of religion, and he will almost invariably, and at once, point to the selfish deformities in the hearts of church members—horrid, filthy tumors to the eyes of the outside world; but worn by their possessors as pre-

cious jewels, while the selfishness of the non-professor who points out these defects may exceed all those of any ten professors in the community. Oh! that we had faith in the unseen spiritual riches of His kingdom to see these things, if only but for a short time, as God sees them; and that these temporal blessings are but loaned to us for a day, to be used by us for the good of His kingdom, we would at once, and for ever, turn this root of selfishness from our hearts, and hurl it from us—rooted out of the garden of the Lord, and plunged into the depth of the sea, or confined to the pagan world, where it properly belongs.

"*Which of you having a servant?*" Here our proper relation to God is stated; we are all servants of God.

"*Gird thyself and serve me, till I have eaten and drunken, and afterward thou shall eat and drink.*" According to the analogy found in the relation which a servant bears to his master, we are not to eat and drink ourselves until we see our brother provided for. Our duty is to him first, and ourselves last, for in this way only can we serve God—as He comes to us in the form of perishing humanity. The table is God's, and all we are worthy of is the crumbs that fall from it; but instead of this, we claim the table as ours, and give Him the crumbs which fall from it. Oh! I fear that if we kept an account of debit on our side, and credit on the other, that at the end of the year we would find ourselves woefully deficient—so much for self, so little for God. But

even this falls short of the truth: "So likewise ye, when ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you;" that is, when you have fulfilled all the demands of the law as faithful servants, (a standard to which even the best of us never arrive,) even then say, "We are unprofitable servants; we have done that which was our duty to do."

PART THIRD.

THE LORD'S MIRACLES.

THE FIRST MIRACLE—WATER TURNED INTO WINE.

"And the third day there was a marriage in Cana of Galilee; and the mother of Jesus was there; and both Jesus was called, and His disciples, to the marriage. And when they wanted wine, the mother of Jesus saith unto Him, They have no wine. Jesus saith unto her, Woman, what have I to do with thee? Mine hour is not yet come. His mother saith unto the servants, Whatsoever He saith unto you, do it. And there were set there six waterpots of stone, after the manner of the purifying of the Jews, containing two or three firkins apiece. Jesus saith unto them, Fill the waterpots with water. And they filled them up to the brim. And He saith unto them, Draw out now, and bear unto the governor of the feast. And they bare it. When the ruler of the feast had tasted the water that was made wine, and knew not whence it was (but the servants which drew the water knew), the governor of the feast called the bridegroom, and saith unto him, Every man at the beginning doth set forth good wine, and when men have well drunk, then that which is worse; but thou hast kept the good wine until now. This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested forth His glory; and His disciples believed on Him."—John ii. 1–11.

THE first question which presents itself for examination is, What is meant by the *third day*, spoken of in the first verse? Commentators usually appear to think that it was the third day after the

calling of Nathaniel as recorded in the first chapter. They come to this conclusion because, they say, it would require two days to go from the Jordan, where John was baptizing, to Cana in Galilee, where this marriage took place. I hardly feel inclined to accept this as a satisfactory answer. In the first chapter I read that John, in company with two of his disciples, saw Jesus coming, and said, "Behold the Lamb of God." The two disciples then follow Jesus, and remain with Him. Then we are told that "the day following, Jesus would go forth into Galilee, and findeth Philip, and saith unto him, Follow Me." Then Philip findeth Nathaniel. This I suppose to have occurred on the way to Galilee, sometime during the first day's journey. Then it must be remembered that weddings almost universally occurred in oriental countries at night. This, then, would give two full days for the journey into Galilee, supposing that the wedding took place on the night of the third day after Christ is recognized as a divine teacher by the disciples of John.

The disciples spoken of here as being invited with Jesus to this feast, and who accompanied Him to the marriage, were the five that He had just accepted, as the twelve were not yet chosen.

Christ's presence at a marriage feast, sanctifying all domestic and social life by His presence, has so often been commented upon that I need say nothing upon this subject here. I will observe, however, that it affords a bold contrast to the practice of John the Baptist, whose mission was one of severe discipline in the desert, typical of the duties of the

parent and Sabbath-school teacher; while the personal mission of Jesus, typical of the gospel minister, is to mingle with all classes, and cheer and encourage, holding forth as a reward of His mission to those who receive His doctrine, an acceptance to the marriage supper of the Lamb.

"*And when they wanted wine, the mother of Jesus saith unto Him, They have no wine.*" Many have supposed that, Jesus having lately arrived with His disciples, several persons from the surrounding country, having heard of His fame, came to see Him, and were naturally invited by His friends to the feast, thereby greatly augmenting the number of invited guests, and thus accounting for the insufficient supply of wine, as provision had not been made for many. Whether this was the case, or whether the insufficiency was the result of neglect and carelessness in looking over the supply, is not necessary here to inquire.

John the evangelist calls Mary the "mother of Jesus," but Christ Himself recognizes no such relationship. "Woman" was a general term, carrying nothing of reproach in its meaning, nor, on the other hand, is it a term of endearment, like that of *mother*. It is quite similar to the word *lady*, as used with us at the present time. Christ addressed her by a term which signified that all carnal relationship was now at an end. She was no more to Him now than any other woman. It is a doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church that Mary is the mother of God, and they strenuously maintain this, in order to strengthen their grounds for giving her undue hom-

age and adoration. I am sorry to see that Rev. Dr. Hodge takes much the same view. I look upon Mary, especially on this occasion, as a type of the Jewish synagogue, or old covenant church.

"*What have I to do with thee, woman?*' Some have supposed that this should be translated, "*What is that to us?*" as much as to say, "What is it to us that they have no wine?" "It is neither your business nor mine that they have neglected to procure a sufficiency of wine." "We have nothing to do with it; it is not our business; leave it to those whose business it is to supply the deficiency." I must confess, that a superficial examination of the Greek words would incline one to accept this view; but when we come to examine all the other passages where these words occur, I am compelled to declare in favor of our translation as being the correct one. The meaning is, "What have we *in common?*" Luke tells us that a certain demoniac, who abode among the tombs, "when he saw Jesus, he cried out, and fell down before Him, and with a loud voice said, What have I to do with Thee, Jesus, Thou Son of the Most High? I beseech Thee, torment me not." Here we have the same words, and they cannot be translated in any other way; and so I find in every *other* case where these words occur. The meaning is clear. Mary was a Jewess, awaiting the establishment of a temporal kingdom. Jesus, now the Christ—the Anointed—is King of a spiritual kingdom. There is no affinity. He recognizes her no longer as His mother. She must no longer pretend to control Him as her son. He is under no obligations to

obey her now. Her dominion ends with the control she exercises over the servants at the feast. She rules the carnal; He the spiritual. The translation, "What is that to us," is a translation of the Roman Catholic Church, and is one of the many efforts to prove Mary to be the mother of God. Scio's Spanish translation has it, "What is that to you and to Me?" Such a translation destroys the truth, fulness, and simplicity of the miracle, and consequently is to be rejected.

"*Mine hour is not yet come.*" What hour did Jesus refer to? Certainly not the hour of His passion. Was it the hour of the full establishment of His spiritual kingdom? That was far away in the future. Was it the hour when He would openly by miracles manifest Himself to the world? I think not, or He would not have performed this miracle at Mary's request, in the very same hour. Some suppose that the wine was not yet exhausted; that a little later it would be all gone, and then would be His time to work a miracle by replenishing it. I am inclined to think that the *hour* referred to was an hour that all the Jews of that time were waiting for—the establishment of a great miraculous kingdom, in which the Messiah King would supply all the wants of His subjects, not by natural process, but by continuous miracle. Christ had now entered upon His public ministry, being now thirty years of age, and it was but natural that His mother should suppose that that hour had fully come. Mary was right in supposing that that hour *would* come, and right in supposing that Jesus would usher it in, but

she was wrong in supposing that it had already come. A long period must yet elapse before it could come. It was not to come under the old Mosaic dispensation. It could not come under the dominion of the law. Nor has it yet come in all its plenitude. It cannot come under the dominion of the flesh. We must arise into the perfect spiritual kingdom, the New Jerusalem of God, before we can enjoy all its blessings. And yet Jesus, by the miracles which He performed while in the flesh, gave a slight foretaste of the coming of that time. It will come, however; and its coming will be ushered in by a marriage feast—the great marriage supper of the Lamb—in which the blessed Bridegroom will supply every invited guest with the new wine of the kingdom.

I think that Mary understood something of this, although her perception may have been very imperfect, for she immediately tells the servants, "Whatsoever He saith unto you, do it." Luke tells us that when He was twelve years of age, He told His mother in the temple, "Wist ye not that I must be about My Father's business?" That she kept all these sayings in her heart; and she knowing the prophecies, and the desire and expectation of her nation, and knowing Him to be the Almighty God, could not but expect that He would now show forth His glory.

All such prophecies as that in the fifty-fifth chapter of Isaiah—"Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy, and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk, without money and without price,"—the Jews under-

stood would be accomplished literally at the coming of the Messiah, and I see no reason why Mary on this occasion should not understand that now all this would be fulfilled. Prophecy had said, "In that day [that is, the *hour* which Jesus says had not yet come,] the mountains shall drop down new wine, and the hills shall flow with milk;" "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that the ploughman shall overtake the reaper, and the treader of grapes him that soweth seed; and the mountains shall drop sweet wine, and all the hills shall melt; and I will bring again the captivity of my people Israel, and they shall build the waste cities and inhabit them."

Mary appears on this occasion to have been a sort of stewardess over the feast, as is evident from the authority she exercises over the servants. The Church, in like manner, admonishes her servants to be obedient to all that their Divine Head commands them to do.

"*There were set there six waterpots of stone, after the manner of the purifying of the Jews, containing two or three firkins apiece.*" A firkin, or rather the Greek measure translated *a firkin* here, was nearly nine gallons, making from seventeen to twenty-five gallons to each waterpot, or about one hundred and twenty six gallons in all; certainly a good supply of wine for a wedding in a country village, and that, too, after the original supply had been exhausted. Outward appearances would justify us in saying that there must have been a large company, or the company knew pretty well how to make use of good wine. I think, however, that but little of this wine was used on this occasion. So large a quantity of

most excellent wine (the best ever made in the world) would be very valuable, and would doubtless be considered a splendid wedding gift. There is no reason to suppose, then, that it was all used at this feast. It may have lasted for years, remaining as a standing testimonial to the company of the power of Him who here performed His first miracle. The large quantity is a proof that there could be no deception. It was just as easy for Him to convert one hundred and twenty-six gallons of water into wine as it would have been to convert one gallon.

I do not wish it to be understood by these remarks that I am an advocate of wine drinking. What I desire is to bring out the truths contained in this passage of Scripture. I shall not assert that this wine was intoxicating, or that it was not. If the Scriptures had told me, I should not hesitate to declare it; but they have not told me. To assert that Christ would not have made fermented wine for a wedding feast, does not frighten me. It is pure assumption. Wine, in whatever state it is found, is His creation. I know that we are told that God creates new wine, and man ferments it. Man has no more power to ferment wine than he has to make it. He may plant the vine and cultivate it; farther he cannot go. He cannot produce the grape, nor form the juice within it. He may extract the juice, and put it in a convenient place where fermentation will take place, but he has no more power to produce fermentation *in* the wine than he has create it. I advocate the temperance cause, based upon the principle of doing good to our race and the suppression of vice;

but every attempt to wrest the Scriptures to support any cause, whether good or bad, I detest. That the immoderate use of wine was permitted under the old covenant is no more an argument in favor of intemperance than a multiplicity of wives permitted to David and Solomon is an argument in favor of adultery. I advocate temperance because I cannot open my eyes without seeing that the habitual use of strong drink is a curse. I can be no friend to a vice which has laid four uncles and a half brother in drunkards' graves, especially when I see their families following the example of their debased and sottish fathers.

"*Six waterpots of stone, after the manner of the purifying of the Jews.*" Here we have the key to the whole miracle. The lesson hinges upon the meaning of this symbolical purification. But why are we told that there were six? Why were there not seven—the mystical number so often used among the Jews? I answer, simply because seven was a symbol of perfectness, and six of imperfectness, being a continual reminder that the purifications of the law failed in being perfect. (Heb. x. 1.) There was still another and a deeper purification required than could be given by the law—a seventh, that would take away sin. These waterpots were perfectly clean. No dregs of wine were to be found in them. They were not old wine casks, from whose dregs a new wine might be engendered. I remember an effort made to prove immersion in baptism by the statement that there were large jars that the Jews immersed in. No one familiar with Jewish

customs could believe such a statement for a moment. Had any one immersed in one of these jars, not only the water, but the jar, would have been polluted, and rendered unfit for a Jewish purification. The water, when used for purifying, was dipped out of the jar and poured over the hands and feet, thus making running or living water of it.

"*Jesus saith unto them, Fill the waterpots with water.*" Water is the symbol of God's word. The antitype of this command was given by Christ to His apostles after His resurrection: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." The servants are commanded here to fill up the waterpots with water, and then "to draw out and bear it to the governor of the feast." The command comes to-day no less distinctly to the ministers or servants of Christ's Church to fill up their own vessels with the water of life—the living word—and then to draw from that source wine for His thirsty Church.

"*The governor of the feast*" was probably an invited guest, an equal. A servant would not speak so freely. He was one who certainly knew the difference between old and new wine, consequently he becomes typical of a sanctified believer.

And now to the miracle itself. Shall we believe it? If Christ was God, I see no difficulty in believing that He had power to perform such a miracle. The Almighty Creator of the universe can as easily convert one hundred and twenty-six gallons of water into wine as He can convert one hundred and twenty-six gallons of the sap that passes through the pores

of a grape vine by a natural process, and by instruments which He Himself has prepared. In the one He makes the vine, He makes the grape, and He makes the wine. In the other the wine is made instantaneously. Almighty creative power is employed in both. Is not one as much of a miracle as the other? The great difference appears to be that the two modes belong to two kingdoms—one to this, the other to that "hour" of Christ's yet to come. The miracle performed in Cana of Galilee was but an anticipation of that hour. "Blessed are they that shall eat bread in the kingdom of God." Blessed are they that shall drink the new wine of the kingdom. Blessed are they who shall partake of the marriage supper in that world of eternal miracle, or rather where what we now look upon as miracle shall be the common order of the kingdom.

This now leads us to a better apprehension of the difference between the wine of the old and that of the new dispensation. The former came by a natural process. The vine was planted within an enclosure and carefully cultivated—typical of those immortal souls planted within the bounds of God's visible kingdom on earth, where they are trained and instructed in His word by human instrumentality. The grapes are gathered; and then comes a crushing, bruising process, typical of the death imposed by the law for sin. And now follows the fermenting process, by which a germ of yeast impregnates the whole dead mass, imparting to it new life and vitality. But in this fermenting process Satan mingles his poison. God sows good seed, but the enemy sows tares.

There is a mingling here of good and evil. The wine contains the elements of cheerfulness, of joy and happiness. It is exhilarating and makes glad the heart of man, but at the same time it inebriates and degrades. Such is the wine of the old dispensation, and when taken to excess it produces madness. Josephus speaks of the Jews during the last days of the ancient kingdom, and during its destruction by Titus, as acting like madmen, men intoxicated, and men filled to excess with wine. Now, the wine of the new kingdom possesses all the invigorating, exhilarating, beneficent qualities of the old, but without Satan's tares. It can only benefit, yield joy, and peace, and happiness, but possesses none of its baleful effects. It contains no ingredient that can injure. Again, the wine of the old dispensation is made from the juice of the grape—the blood and strength and toil of the member of the visible kingdom; while the wine of the new dispensation is made from pure water—emblem of the gospel—and blood—not the blood of the disciple, but the blood of Christ. "This cup is the New Testament in *My blood*, which is shed for many for the remission of sins."

"*This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee.*" Alford very properly translates this passage: "*This wrought Jesus as the beginning of His miracles.*" I think there can be no reason why Alford is not correct, as this was undoubtedly the first miracle that Jesus performed; and if such is the case, it completely annihilates all the miracles recorded by tradition as having been performed by Him in His infancy. In all the early life of Jesus,

until He was thirty years of age, only one sentence of all His conversation during these years has been recorded by the evangelist, and handed down to us for our instruction—"Wist ye not that I must be in My Father's house?" But when Scripture has been silent, that hoary-headed old liar, *Tradition*, has not failed to proclaim his babbling nonsense to the world. I will now refer to some of the miracles of the infancy; and as we proceed in the study of these true miracles, we shall have abundant opportunity of seeing how false and silly are all those not recorded by the inspired evangelists. The apochryphal gospels contain a string of childish miracles, so different from those recorded in the inspired record, that we may well know that "These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing ye might have life through His name;" while those were written only to deceive, and doubtless to cast ridicule upon the cause of our Redeemer. But to proceed. Some children refused to play with Jesus, but ran away and hid themselves, but He, pursuing them, changed them into kids. Another child ran against Him and threw Him down, whereupon He, being exasperated, exclaimed, "As thou hast made Me to fall, so shalt thou fall and not rise;" at the same time the child fell down and expired. He has a dispute with His school-master about the way He should pronounce some Hebrew letters, when His master strikes Him. He curses His master, whose arm withers, and he falls upon his face and dies. At five years of age He is making sparrows out of clay in a pool of water on the

Sabbath day. Another boy comes along, and drains off the pool of water. Jesus curses Him, and immediately he dries up and dies. These things went on till Joseph says to Mary, "Henceforth let us keep Him within doors, for whosoever sets himself against Him perishes. Jesus enters the house of a dyer, and throws all the clothes sent in by different persons to be dyed of different colors into a big kettle of dye. The dyer comes in, very much enraged, and, taking the clothes from the kettle, finds that each one is colored according to order. In company with some other boys He makes birds and animals out of clay, and then blowing upon those He had made, they all fly and run away; and then when He calls them they come back, and eat out of His hands. While an infant, in His mother's arms, He commanded a palm tree to stoop down and deliver its fruit to His mother; and the tree obeyed. Going to a well for a pitcher of water, He broke the pitcher, and brought the water back in His cloak. The night He was born, an ox and an ass knelt down and worshipped Him.

On reading such trash as this, one feels almost inclined to say, as he finds repeatedly such expressions as "The holy child Jesus," that if tradition told the truth, He must have been a very unholy young devil. Shame on that church which accepts tradition as equal to Scripture. How immensely different these traditions are from the unvarnished history of the first miracle as recorded by the inspired evangelist. The miracles of the infancy, even had they been true, would have been but low conjurer's tricks, with

no meaning, and breathing nothing but a spirit of selfishness and revenge; while on the other hand, the miracles performed by our Lord Jesus are lessons of divine wisdom, and manifest the character and spirit of the Son of God.

"*There were set there six waterpots of stone, after the manner of the purifying of the Jews.*" I have said that this was the key to the proper understanding of the whole miracle, and I now add, will aid us materially in the interpretation of the miracles which follow. These waterpots were set apart by the family for purposes of purification. Pure water in all these cases was a symbol of God's word. We have in the Old and New Testaments two great prophets, one the counterpart of the other; one the personification of the Old Covenant, and the other of the new—Moses and Jesus. As blood was a symbol of the law, and wine more directly a symbol of a germ of new life infiltrated into a dead law, we are not surprised to find that the very first miracle performed in public by Moses was turning water into blood, while the first miracle performed by Jesus was to turn water into wine. (Ex. vii. 14–18.) Moses stretches his rod over the waters of Egypt, and they become blood. Jesus stretches His hand over the waters used for the purification of Israel, and they become wine. Moses performs all his miracles by the instrumentality of the rod. "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." The rod must chastise all who break God's law. Christ uses no rod; His is a mission of peace. Moses' miracles are all curses to the enemies of Israel, and very few, if any,

of those performed in the desert were not attended with a curse upon Israel, except those performed between the Red Sea and Sinai; while but one of Christ's is not attended with a blessing, and that one, the miracle performed upon the barren fig-tree, this being a symbol of the curse poured out upon apostate Israel, because they rejected the Savior of the world.

The ruler of the feast did not know where the new wine came from, but "*the servants which drew the water knew.*" He who enjoys the wine of the kingdom, may not know the process by which it is brought to him—how it was made, or from whence it came, but God's ministers should know, and do, if they are not false prophets. They may not know all the secrets of its manufacture. Their duty is to obey; draw the water and pour it in the appointed place; draw off and bear to the guests; and they will find that, in the process, it has been converted into rich wine. The servants of God's kingdom who preach the gospel may not know the process by which souls are saved, but they know that that which is symbolized by purifying water, the word preached, under the power of the Holy Spirit becomes efficacious to the saving of the soul. Paul says, "It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe."

"*Every man at the beginning doth set forth good wine, and when men have well drunk, then that which is worse; but thou hast kept the good wine until now.*" Oh! how true. The world gives its good wine first. Witness the process. The pleas-

ures of the world are sweet at first, but they end in husks—the food of swine. The prodigal's first entrance into the world, after the restraints to which he had been subject at home were all severed, was doubtless happy indeed; but he soon spends all, then becomes a servant to an outside Gentile, and finally is sent to feed swine; and starving, miserable, poor, and naked, he would gladly partake of the swine's food, but no man gave unto him.

The great empire of this world, whose golden head reared itself in majestic grandeur before Nebuchadnezzar's vision, ended in feet made of iron, mixed with brittle clay. Nineveh and Babylon, whose riches and wonders astonished the nations of antiquity, all faded away into masses of unshapely ruin.

Egypt, that built the pyramids, is to-day a land of miserable beggars, who live by robbing strangers, and selling them the bones of their ancestors. Greece and Rome are but skeletons of what they once were.

But look at it in another aspect, and see how true it again appears. In youth we are happy. These bodies, which have been created by a natural process, as all animal bodies are, grow and arrive at maturity, being comparatively free from pain in youth; but as they verge on to old age, the wine of life becomes more and more bitter, till nothing but the dregs remain—life is exhausted and death follows. Such is the record of this world, in whatever aspect we view it. It perishes with the using.

Nor is this alone applicable to the world. It is

the history of the old covenant as well as the history of the world. Under the old dispensation we commence well; we think that we can keep the law, and we may flatter ourselves that we do for a while; but it becomes more and more heavy, until, like a mountain weight, it crushes us into the grave. How often we have observed this great truth as we have read the history of the kings of Israel and Judah. They almost invariably commence well, continue faithful for a time, and end in disgrace. On account of the peculiar relation they bore to the old dispensation, there are but very few exceptions to this rule.

But when we have learned that the law will not save us, and we lose all confidence in our own righteousness, then comes a voice saying, "There is no wine." The old covenant church, finding that she is incapable of saving herself or her seed, appeals to her Son, telling Him of the world's great need and the church's desire. The wine is exhausted. The world cannot save us. The old covenant cannot save us. The law cannot save us. All has vanished with the using. The wine is gone. The leather bottles, once so full and plump, are cast like old rags into a corner. The bitter, sour wine is all gone. What is to be done? A burning desire has been excited even by the bitterness of this vile stuff, which, if not quenched, must burn to the very depths of hell. Oh! what is to be done? Here we see the similarity to the case of the prodigal, when the old wine from his father's house was exhausted. "There was a great famine in the land," which, the prophet says, "was not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of

hearing the words of the Lord." None but a wonder-working God can quench this desire. None but an Almighty Redeemer can supply the want.

And His command is given: "Fill the water-pots." Not the old leather bottles, which are now useless and will not hold new wine, and which are naturally, from the very beginning, polluted and polluting, on account of the animal nature of the material of which they are composed. Fill the stone jars of the law's purification with pure water. This is the labor of the gospel minister. The church is suffering with a famine, and she calls upon Jesus for aid. She trains her ministers for the occasion, and He now calls upon them to fill up the water-pots with living water—the pure, unadulterated Word of God. These obey the command, and administer it to the guests, who find upon trial that it is the very best of living wine. The work is done, and oh, what a change! The poor, miserable, ragged, hungry, filthy tender of Gentile swine is seated at his father's table, clothed like a prince, and in his right mind. The chaff driven before the wind, which once formed the feet of iron and clay of Nebuchadnezzar's image, is now transformed into the mighty empire of King Immanuel, whose gates of pearl shame into insignificance the once golden-headed Babylon. The old covenant has given way to the new, and the gospel has supplanted the law. Oh! is not the new wine better than the old? The law comes by a natural process from Moses; but grace and truth---the wine of the new covenant—comes by Jesus Christ. These mortal bodies, which,

like the old wine, were formed by a natural process, will also be supplanted by a new creation. Oh! the new wine is better than the old!

"*He manifested forth His glory.* Trench, on the Miracles, says the word "glory" here means Christ's divinity. "We beheld His glory": He manifested to us His divinity. The silly nonsense of tradition has shown the folly of men. Christ's first miracle reveals His glory. And the glory revealed to those who drink of the wine of the new covenant will be manifest when the dregs of earth, its riches and its kingdoms and its honors, have all gone the way of the old wine.

"*His disciples believed on Him.*" Those who drink the wine of the new covenant believe on Jesus. There are no exceptions. They know His power to save. They know that the old wine must be exhausted, but they know that the new is far better. The world must vanish, the law perish; but the new wine endures for ever. "An angel's arm cannot snatch me from the grave," but, thanks to Him that sitteth upon the throne, if I have known the efficacy of the new wine, "legions of angels cannot confine me there."

THE MIRACULOUS DRAUGHT OF FISHES.

"Now it came to pass, while the multitude pressed upon Him and heard the word of God, that He was standing by the lake of Gennesaret; and He saw two boats standing by the lake: but the fishermen had gone out of them, and were washing their nets. And He entered into one of the boats, which was Si-

mon's, and asked him to put out a little from the land. And He sat down and taught the multitudes out of the boat. And when He had left speaking, He said unto Simon, Put out into the deep, and let down your nets for a draught. And Simon answered and said, Master, we toiled all night, and took nothing; but at Thy word I will let down the nets. And when they had this done, they inclosed a great multitude of fishes; and their nets were breaking, and they beckoned unto their partners in the other boat, that they should come and help them. And they came, and filled both the boats, so that they began to sink. But Simon Peter, when he saw it, fell down at Jesus' knees, saying, Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord. For he was amazed, and all that were with him, at the draught of the fishes which they had taken; and so were also James and John, sons of Zebedee, who were partners with Simon. And Jesus said unto Simon, Fear not; from henceforth thou shalt catch men. And when they had brought their boats to land, they left all, and followed Him.—LUKE v. 1–11.—*Revised Version.*

CONSIDERING the miracles of our Lord to be lessons of divine wisdom, intended to instruct and edify His Church, and not a mere record of tricks performed by a conjurer to amuse or astonish an ignorant and gaping crowd, I shall endeavor to present such analogies as I find running through the record and history of the Church, showing God's wonderful dealings with His people in all times and in all ages. This miracle is of peculiar value, from the fact that the fishermen here concerned afterwards became preachers of the Gospel; or, as Christ expresses it, "*fishers of men.*"

Jesus stands upon the shores of the lake of Galilee. A crowd presses upon Him, to hear the Word of God. Two boats, belonging to fishermen, were there. The owners had gone out of them, and were washing their nets. We find something very sig-

nificant in this, as the nets were the implements of their business. After toiling in vain all night, and having accomplished nothing, they are now preparing their nets for a future effort. This indicates that they were men of perseverance. They were not lazy men, or they would have been resting after a night's toil, or idling away their time. We wonder if there were no corner grocery store there, where they could lounge around and do nothing. Doubtless there were such fishermen then, as now, who found such places, where they could conveniently kill time while waiting another opportunity for catching fish. God says, "What thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might." And the man who will say in this busy age that he can find nothing to do is either a liar or a fool, if not both.

"*They were washing their nets.*" It has just been observed, that their nets were their tools. No sensible man will employ an artisan whose tools are all out of repair. If his tools are dull, or rusty, or broken, it is a very fair proof that he himself is dull, and rusty, and broken, if not even in a worse condition. No sensible man, in any business or employment outside of that of preaching (I will not say preaching the gospel, because no man *can* preach the gospel without being prepared), would even think of going to work without tools; and yet we find a host of men, perfectly ignorant of the gospel, scattered about the country, preaching ignorance. The fishermen of Galilee washed their nets. Would that some of these self-called preachers would wash off some of their ignorance before attempting to catch men.

Christ enters Simon s boat, and now we find Simon with Him in the boat. He left washing his nets, and comes to sit at the feet of the Great Teacher, and wash his spiritual net from the dark night of ignorance through which he had been toiling; and there he sat three years before he himself became a teacher of others. This proved his divine mission when he did go. Some tell us that the ignorant men who go about to-day are called of God. God, it is true, calls fishermen from their nets, and men from the plow, and the anvil, and workshop; but He proves the call, by opening up for them a way to be educated; and if He has not done this, it is proof evident and manifest that He has not called them. If they cannot show that God has opened up a way by which they may be taught, then we may consider them as but cheats and impostors.

Nor is this all. By their false pretences they encourage others in ignorance and laziness. Ignorance, in fact, in such men is the result of laziness. Shame on the lazy men, who, year after year, pretend to preach the gospel, and yet have not energy enough, or are too lazy, even to learn the common rules of their mother tongue. Ignorance is a proof of laziness, and both belong to Satan's kingdom, and are marks of the beast. God's kingdom is life, and light, and energy, and knowledge. Shun all such impostors as you would the plague. If you tell me that these men must work to support their families, and have no time to study, then I tell you that you prove that God has not called them. Peter had to work to support his family, but when Christ called him He

provided for his family, and filled the net full, even to breaking. These men are without excuse, other than that of being actuated by an ignorant, crazy fanaticism. If they wish us to believe them, let them present the proofs which the fishermen of Galilee presented when sent out to preach the gospel to the Gentile world, and we will follow them. Let them come, like Peter, to the house of Cornelius, the first Gentile convert, with three and a half years' instructions at the feet of John and Jesus; with eight, or, as some say, twelve years' instruction in and around the temple at Jerusalem by the Holy Ghost, sent down from on high, filling him with a knowledge of the Scriptures, and the ability to speak all languages, and then we will believe that their mission is divine. How often the *infamous lie* is cast in our faces that Christ called and sent out ignorant fishermen to preach the gospel. Yes, He did call ignorant fishermen, but He *did not send them out* until they were educated fully up to the standard of the highest doctors of divinity of our age. Not one single Gentile convert was made until these men had received twelve or fifteen years of most superior instruction under the guidance of a divine teacher—Christ in the flesh and Christ in the Holy Comforter.

"*Master, we have toiled all night, and have taken nothing; nevertheless at Thy word I will let down the net.*" We observe here the strong faith of Peter. The night—the very time to catch fish—was past, and they had toiled all that night and caught nothing; yet Peter's faith was strong in the Lord. Is it not strange that he should afterwards deny Him? Did

he not know that He had, even if crucified and put to death, power to rise again from the grave?

It is not necessary that the miracle here should be the creation of an immense quantity of fishes, but that by Divine power they should be brought together in this place at this time. But He who creates and feeds the fish has power to re create or bring together at His own will. "Thou madest Him to have dominion over the works of Thy hands; Thou hast put all things under His feet; all sheep and oxen and the beasts of the field; the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea, and whatsoever passeth through the paths of the seas." (Psalm viii. 6–8.)

"*The net brake.*" "*The net was breaking.*" Alford translates, "*was about breaking;*" not that it did break, but was just on the point of breaking. This makes better sense than our translation, and is undoubtedly correct. If the net had been broken the fish would have escaped, which was not the case.

Peter's expression, "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord," was from a sudden sense of his own unholiness, just as the Israelites at Mt. Sinai exclaimed, "Let not God speak, lest we die." Such language is often found in Scripture as expressions of humility, and we ourselves use them when we feel our own unworthiness before God.

But do we realize that every similar event of life is accomplished by Divine power? God's language on this point is emphatic and decisive: "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it; except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain." The same may be said of

every event of life. All our success through life, and our salvation in death, depends upon Him who worketh in us to will and to do of His own good pleasure.

"*James and John were partners with Simon.*" Observe here how God chooses His servants from among the occupations of early life most adapted to fit them for the field of labor to which He destines them in later years. The fishers of men are chosen from among the fishermen of Galilee. David, the shepherd of Israel, was chosen from the care of his father's flocks. The Magi of the East, whose favorite study was astrology, were chosen to be the first to worship the Star of Bethlehem in His cradle.

Fishermen of men,—"*From henceforth thou shalt catch men*,"—What does this mean? Undoubtedly, that they should become apostles, and catch men for Christ's kingdom, using the gospel as they had formerly used their nets, to catch fish. This is explained by the prophet Jeremiah: "Behold, I will send for many fishers, saith the Lord, and they shall fish them; and after that I will send for many hunters, and they shall hunt them from every mountain, and from every hill, and out of the holes of the rocks." The "mountains" and "rocks," in which they had taken refuge, were a "refuge of lies." (Jer. xvi. 16–21.)

But is this the true meaning? May we not be mistaken in this? Is there any analogy between the taking of live fish in their native element, where they are perfectly contented and happy, and hauling them out to die in an element where they cannot live?

Julian the Apostate observed, that the Galilean did indeed most aptly term His apostles "fishers," for as the fisherman draws out the fish from waters where they were free and happy, to an element in which they cannot breathe, but must presently perish, so did these." Trench answers this by saying, that the word ζωγρων, means, not only to catch, but "to take them *for life*, and not for death;" and the Revised Version has "*take alive*" in the margin. But Alford rejects this translation, calling it too subtle, and not according to the rules of emphasis. That in both cases in which it is used here, one in which it is applied to men, and in the other to fish, it merely means to catch. It is quite amusing to see the way these theologians wander, groping in a fog, when a very little light would put them right. The word undoubtedly means to *catch alive*, and has the same meaning in both places. Both the fish and the men are caught alive in their own native element, and taken out into an element into which they cannot live, and they both die. How is this? Where is the analogy?

I answer, that we will find no analogy if we look for it upon the surface. We must look elsewhere for it. Such an analogy would never have been sought in the wrong place if our theologians had gone to the depth of the miracle.

The sea is the pagan world; the ship was the kingdom of Israel, now the Church of Christ, and the fishermen her ministers. The night of toil, in which they caught nothing, was the old dispensation.

And oh! what a long, tempestuous night it was! How many terrible waves had dashed over the vessel during that stormy night! The dragon of Egypt had risen up in foaming rage against her, but he and his armies were buried beneath her own Red Sea waves. "The horse and his rider both he cast into the sea." The hurricanes of the desert had blown over her; but she was permitted to weather them all, and pass in safety over the Jordan. Canaan's mighty hosts had dashed in fury against her sides, but Joshua's conquering arm had laid them in the dust. Philistia and Nineveh had hurled their fiery darts at her, but she had resisted them all. But in the marshes of Babylon she hung her harps upon the willows, almost wrecked in the mire of despond. At last the day breaks, and we find her safely anchored on the banks of the Jordan, and her fishermen busily engaged in washing their nets by the light of the morning star, John the Baptist, "a burning and shining light, in which they rejoiced to walk for a season."

The night of toil is now ended, but they have caught nothing. Not a single nation has been converted to a knowledge of the true God. The ship is safe, but she has brought no pagan nation into her bosom. The promise given to Abraham, that in her all the nations of the earth should be blessed, was as yet unfulfilled. No nation or tribe had as yet been drawn under the folds of her banner. True, a temple had been erected in Egypt, but its adherents were Jewish merchants who carried on business in

Alexandria, and owed allegiance to Jerusalem. The Abyssinians had received circumcision in Solomon's time, but they did not fraternize with the Jews, except as some proselyte or Jewish captive wended his way up to pay his dues at Jerusalem. True, a few proselytes had been made, but what were they among the millions which comprised the great sea of paganism?

But Christ comes, and lo! a great multitude, that no man could number, of all nations, kindreds and tongues, are gathered around Him who stands at the helm in Mount Sion.

Now, observe the peculiarity of Christ's language on this occasion. He does not say, "I will make you fishers of *souls*." He says, "I will make you fishers of *men*." *Man*, in his carnal nature, is an inhabitant of the deep sea of the pagan world. An enemy of God, he must be slain by the sharp sword that proceedeth out of His mouth. He must die to his native element—Satan's kingdom. His carnal nature must be slain. To the great deep of Satan—the *Abyss* of Revelation, he must die for ever. The carnal nature must die; it cannot see the kingdom of God. The new life as a son of God is spoken of in Scripture as a new creation. As carnal men, those taken in the gospel net by Christ's ministers, die to their own native element—sin; but they walk in newness of life in Christ. Here, then, we behold a perfect analogy.

CHRIST STILLING THE TEMPEST.

"Now it came to pass on a certain day, that He went into a ship with His disciples; and He said unto them, Let us go over unto the other side of the lake. And they launched forth. But as they sailed He fell asleep; and there came down a storm of wind on the lake; and they were filled with water (were filling with water), and were in jeopardy. And they came to Him, and awoke Him, saying, Master, Master, we perish. Then He arose, and rebuked the wind and the raging of the water; and they ceased, and there was a calm. And He said unto them, Where is your faith? And they being afraid wondered, saying one to another, What manner of man is this! for He commandeth even the winds and water, and they obey Him?"—LUKE viii. 22–25.

THE solution of the lesson taught by this miracle is very plain and simple, if we only bear in mind the imagery common to all the miracles and parables. The ship is the ancient Jewish church; the sea, the pagan world; the winds, false doctrine; the storm, the rage of the heathen and infidel against the truth when impelled by false doctrine. The carnal Christ of the old dispensation sleeps; the Shekinah burns dimly and finally goes out, but the Holy Comforter of the new dispensation neither slumbers nor sleeps.

Mark tells us that this miracle occurred on the evening of the same day in which Jesus had spoken the parables recorded by Him, and so fully given in the thirteenth chapter of Matthew; and if we look for a connecting link here, we must naturally expect it to be in some way symbolical of the kingdom of heaven, to which all of those parables refer. Many wonder why this miracle should be displaced in the history given by Matthew; but I find no difficulty in

the case, as I do not by any means consider the four gospels as so many connected histories of chronological events, but a series of circumstances, classified by each evangelist according to the peculiar lessons they were intended to convey, and arranged so that miracles and parables having more or less the same affinity and the same object in view should be connected, and thus show their relation to each other.

After a hard day's work, our Savior desired to withdraw from the multitude, and pass over to the other side of the lake. But before the journey was accomplished, a sudden storm comes down upon them—no unusual thing on those small lakes surrounded by mountains, where the wind often breaks suddenly through some of the valleys or gorges, and comes down with the force of a hurricane.

"*But as they sailed He fell asleep.*" We find in the Old Testament a history quite similar to this—Jonah, fleeing from duty, sleeps in a storm. Jesus, resting from duty, sleeps in a storm. The one is loaded with conscious guilt; the other, whose pure soul no guilt could tarnish, sleeps in the human nature, while the divine controls the winds and the waves, and is even Himself the Master of the elements.

"*He arose and rebuked the wind, and the raging of the water; and they ceased, and there was a calm.*" And now how different here is the result from that of the case of Jonah? This sleeper arises and quells the storm. He speaks the word, "Peace, be still," and the elements obey His voice. In the other, the sleeper must be given over to the power of the ele-

ments. He must be cast into the sea; and oh! what a world-wide history have we here! Jonah, the champion of the law, must be swallowed up by the raging sea, but the storm itself is destroyed by the voice of Him who is the heart and soul of the gospel. Or, carrying the figure still further, supposing the ship to be ancient Israel, and the sea the heathen or Gentile world, Israel sleeping through the long night of the Old Covenant ages, is only aroused by the armies of Vespasian and Titus, to be cast into the surging waves of the heathen world, engulfed and buried; while Christ speaks the words, "Peace, be still," and the Gentile nations "beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks." Oh, how true! To apostate Israel shall be given no other sign than that of the prophet Jonah. How have they been for ages swallowed up of the Gentile world? Will you tell me that these miracles are but the simple tricks of a conjurer, or are they prophecies whose fulfilment is but part of the world-wide history of the manifestations of a wonder-working God in His dealings with our race? And oh! how true it was, that during that dark, stormy night of the old dispensation, the Lord had apparently gone to sleep, and the vessel was fast filling with water,—not the pure running water of the Jordan, but the muddy waves of a shallow, stormy sea, and they were in jeopardy. They had struck upon the marshy shallows of old Babylon. Foreign armies, like deluging waves, had rolled over and devastated their country; had destroyed their magnificent temple and carried away its golden treasures, and sold

the flower of the nation into bondage. And the storm still rages. Babylon had given way to Persia, and Persia to Greece, and Greece to Rome, the waves of each in turn dashing over her their peculiarities of false religion. And our Lord sleeps! The light of the Shekinah had deserted the temple for ever. The living oracle of prophecy was now silent. For four hundred years no prophet had said, "Thus saith the Lord."

But when His disciples, feeling themselves lost, come to Him crying, "Lord, save, or we perish," then the sleeper rises like a giant refreshed with slumber; rises from Joseph's new tomb, amid the salt sea-waves of the soldiers of Pontius Pilate, who stand trembling around His grave, and by the light of Pentecostal fire He commands the powers of darkness, "Peace, be still," and the Church of the new dispensation rides like a noble ship safely into the harbor of eternal peace. Luke says that "He rebuked the wind and the raging of the water." Similar language to this we find in the one hundred and sixth Psalm. "He *rebuked* the Red Sea also, and it was dried up; so He led them through the depths as through a wilderness, and He saved them from the hand of him that hated them, and redeemed them from the hand of the enemy. And the waters covered their enemies; there was not one of them left." The storm raised by their own winds of false doctrine, error, deception, and falsehood, in the end overwhelm them, and they perish in the pit which their own hands have dug for God's people.

Again, in the eighty-ninth Psalm, we read, "O

Lord God of Hosts, who is a strong Lord like unto Thee? Thou rulest the raging of the sea; when the waves thereof arise, Thou stillest them. Thou hast broken Rahab [Egypt] in pieces, as one that is slain. Thou hast scattered Thine enemies with Thy strong arm."

Moses stretched his rod over the waters, the rod probably being a symbol of the authority of the divine law; but Christ, in the living voice, gives the command, and He is obeyed.

And here, again, the idea that the sea is a symbol of the heathen world gives us a more enlarged view of the symbolical meaning of the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea. It is not only a type of the hour of death, but a symbol of the believer's passage through Satan's kingdom in this world. We are told that on that occasion the waters were congealed (probably frozen) in the midst of the sea. How often would the wicked have overwhelmed the Church of God, had they not been held in check by the fear of divine retribution, restrained by the fear of future vengeance; their power paralyzed, congealed by the fear of the rod accompanying Moses' law.

As there is no record of the disciples ever having been baptized with water, and no inference of any thing of the kind, except in the case of two, of whom it is said they were disciples of John, some of the early fathers have supposed that they were baptized into Christ on this occasion, as the Israelites were into Moses on crossing the Red Sea. There can be no doubt but their faith was increased by this

event. As for the baptism of the Israelites, either in or with water, it is all perfect nonsense. "They believed God and His servant, Moses." This believing in God was their baptism. The disciples believed that Jesus had power over the winds and the waves, and this baptism is of ten thousand times more consequence than all the water baptisms in the world. The great salt sea of paganism has baptized our world and our race so deeply that it requires something more powerful than material water to remove the foul stain of sin.

There is still another, and a similar event in the history of our world, in which baptism is referred to as a saving element. Peter says, "God waited long in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few—that is, eight souls—were saved by water; the like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." Those who are baptized into Christ—not immersed into the sea of the pagan world, but safely housed in the ark—are saved, while the antediluvian world, like Pharaoh and his host, perish in the mighty waters.

It has been a common custom in all ages to represent the Church as a ship riding upon the surface of the sea, in times of peace upon its calm, tranquil bosom, and in times of adversity and persecution, as being tossed upon its stormy waves. Paintings of this kind have been exhibited in all ages since the establishment of Christianity. Nor is this a favorite

idea alone of professors of Christianity, but pagan authors and pagan artists have represented their gods as sailing on the sea in a ship. The Egyptians were fond of this representation.

And the ancient prophets of Israel have also favored this imagery. Ezekiel, in his prophecy against Tyrus, an apostate church, and corresponding with the Babylon of the Revelation, compares him to a ship full of merchandise, and tossed on a stormy sea. The whole of this prophecy will apply well to Israel, and in fact is far more applicable to Israel than to the ancient city of Tyre. Such language as the following can only be applied to an apostate: "Thou hast been in Eden, the garden of God; every precious stone was thy covering: the sardius, topaz, and the diamond. * * * * * Thou art the anointed cherub, that covereth; and I have set thee so; thou wast upon the holy mountain of God; thou hast walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire; thou wast perfect in thy ways from the day that thou wast created till iniquity was found in thee." And how well the following language will apply to the destruction of apostate Judah, and his scattering amid all the nations of the Gentile world: "Thy rowers have brought thee into great waters; the east wind hath broken thee in the midst of the seas. Thy riches, and thy fairs, and thy merchandise, thy mariners and thy pilots, * * * * and all thy men of war that are in thee, and all thy company which is in the midst of thee, shall fall into the midst of thy seas, in the day of thy ruin." Then the merchants are represented as crying, "What

city is like Tyrus, like the destroyed in the midst of the sea, * * * * * in the time when thou shalt be broken by the seas in the depths of the waters."

Nor should we limit this figure of a ship to either a true or an apostate church, for it is applicable to every living man. Does the carnal Christ sleep within you?—I mean that instruction which you have received from Christ by human instrumentality? Does the storm rage without? Are you in danger of ruin? Arouse the sleeper: call upon your God. Perchance He may arouse from His slumber and calm the troubled elements, and by doing so prove to you His almighty power over the dominion of Satan.

But oh! sinner, are you the one who sleeps? Are you locked in the icy embrace of soul-death? Have you hushed the voice of conscience for ever? Has ever the sleeping Christ abandoned you? Then the fate of Tyrus is yours.

Have you taken refuge in a false hope? Are you in a ship manned by pagan gods, whose captain and whose pilot is the prince of the power of the air? Apollyon is his name—the Destroyer—the king of darkness, whose kingdom is the awful abyss, or bottomless pit, to which he would hasten you. If so, your ruin is certain and sure.

Awake, arouse that sleeping conscience! Call upon Him who is mighty to save from the powers of death and hell; and cease not until a great calm has come into your soul, and you know that your faith in Jesus as the Savior of sinners is strongly

bound to Him, and your bark, guided by His almighty arm and His unerring eye, is peacefully, safely, and serenely guided straight on towards the haven of eternal peace.

HEALING THE DEMONIAC, OR POSSESSED OF DEVILS.

"And they arrived at the country of the Gadarenes, which is over against Galilee. And when He went forth to land, there met Him out of the city a certain man, which had devils long time, and ware no clothes, neither abode in any house, but in the tombs. When he saw Jesus, he cried out, and fell down before Him, and with a loud voice said, What have I to do with Thee, Jesus, thou Son of God most high? I beseech Thee, torment me not. (For He had commanded the unclean spirit to come out of the man. For oftentimes it had caught him: and he was kept bound with chains and in fetters; and he brake the bands, and was driven of the devil into the wilderness.) And Jesus asked him, saying, What is thy name? And he said, Legion: because many devils were entered into him. And they besought Him that He would not command them to go out into the deep. And there was there a herd of many swine feeding on the mountain: and they besought Him that He would suffer them to enter into them. And He suffered them. Then went the devils out of the man, and entered into the swine: and the herd ran violently down a steep place into the lake, and were choked. When they that fed them saw what was done, they fled, and went and told it in the city and in the country. Then they went out to see what was done; and came to Jesus, and found the man, out of whom the devils were departed, sitting at the feet of Jesus, clothed, and in his right mind: and they were afraid. They also which saw it told them by what means he that was possessed of the devils was healed. Then the whole multitude of the country of the Gadarenes round about besought Him to depart from them; for they were taken with

great fear: and He went up into the ship, and returned back again. Now the man, out of whom the devils were departed, besought Him that he might be with Him: but Jesus sent him away, saying, Return to thine own house, and show how great things God hath done unto thee. And he went his way, and published throughout the whole city how great things Jesus had done unto him."—LUKE viii. 26–39.

THE subject which we now have before us is probably one of the most difficult in Scripture. The subject of demoniacal possession is one which has puzzled the minds of theologians in all ages, and has ever been a stumbling block to the weak and vacillating, and an object of sport and ridicule to the infidel. In taking up this question at present, I do not propose to remove all difficulties, and leave it perfectly clear to the minds of my readers, but only throw such light on the subject as I have at command, hoping that, in the future, a more thorough study of God's word may remove all difficulties, and make the subject perfectly plain to all who are interested.

On the very threshold of this miracle we meet with two important difficulties in the harmony of the records. Matthew tells us that, after passing the stormy night on the sea of Galilee, they came to the country of the *Gergesenes*. Mark and Luke tell us that they came to the country of the Gadarenes. I think this can easily be explained, as we are not told that they came into either of these towns, but into the "country;" that is, into territory claimed by one or perhaps both of these towns. However, I notice that both Alford and the *Revised Version*, doubtless copying Tischendorf's ancient

manuscript, has *Gadarenes* in Matthew, thus entirely removing this difficulty.

The other difficulty is, that Matthew speaks of two demoniacs, while Mark and Luke mention only one. The usual way of reconciling this discrepancy, is to say that there were *two*, as Matthew says, but one being a prominent character, Mark and Luke speak of only one, leaving the other in the background, as having been a companion with the first in his residence in the tombs, but not partaking with him Christ's healing power and His consequent conversion. This does not appear to me to be satisfactory.

Some modern critic has suggested that one was the madman and the other his keeper, but this does not answer the purpose. There, is, however a way of reconciling this discrepancy that would give satisfaction, did it find favor in any of the ancient readings; but as it stands now, it is only assumption, and yet I prefer it to any other solution I have yet met with. It is, that Matthew wrote "*a* possessed of devils," but some transcriber, seeing immediately after the word "we," which appears to be the language of the devils, and not of the man, he has changed "*a*" to "two." This leads me to notice that Matthew uses the plural, "we," throughout the narrative, but Mark and Luke commence by using "I" as the language of the legion, and later change it to "we." Mark says that the man came and worshipped Jesus, and then the conversation commences with the legion, beginning with the singular and ending with the plural.

This remarkable narrative brings us in contact with

the whole subject of *demoniacal possession;* and not only this, but all other references to this subject in the Scriptures lead us to accept it as a historical truth. It does not belong to that class of questions growing out of those discrepancies caused by the carelessness of transcribers, or the choosing of one name by one of the evangelists, and another name by another, when either would have been appropriate. This is a part of the sacred history, and is so interwoven with it, that if it is false, then the gospels must be false also. We must accept it as it stands, or cast the gospels away.

Nor can we say, as some do, that it was only a superstition of the time, and that Jesus favored it, either not daring to contradict, or caring to resist it. If Jesus had been a mere man, I would be willing to accept this theory; but believing Him to be God—the truth, and the King of the truth—I cannot for a moment suspect Him of thus conniving at falsehood.

Nor are we to confound this malady with diseases to which men are now subject, and were at that time. Jesus performed miracles upon the sick, restoring them to health, either by putting His hands upon them or speaking the word; but these cases of men possessed with devils were accurately specified, and can in no way be classed with those. In the case before us, as well as in others, the man is represented as acting, speaking, independent of the evil spirit, and the evil spirit as acting and speaking independent of the man. Such things as these cannot be confounded with natural diseases.

Nor, again, can we confound these maladies with such modern diseases as delirium tremens, or hydrophobia, or even with lunacy. These are natural diseases, and can all be accounted for on natural principles; and were Jesus present and exerted His power in behalf of such persons, He would heal them in the same way that He did those who were suffering with the natural diseases of Palestine.

This is no poison injected into the blood, like that of hydrophobia; nor is it a burning fever, disordering the brain, like that produced by an excess of ardent spirits in delirium tremens.

It appears to be rather more like a case of clairvoyance or mesmerism, in which the clairvoyant is not a man of powerful nervous temperament, controlling at will one of weak temperament, and entirely subjecting his will to his own, but Satan himself, or some of his chosen angels, in which the subject is at the control of the stronger power, led on and actuated at will, and yet having his lucid intervals, in which he realizes his sad condition, as in the case of this man, who came to Jesus and worshipped Him—just what he would not have done if this legion had had full control over him at all times.

Before going farther, I will notice here a discrepancy in our translation which may give us some light on this difficult subject. Our word *devil*, from the Greek word *diabolos*, is Satan himself, and in the original is never applied to any other. In all these cases, I mean those similar to the one now under discussion, the Greek word is δαιμων, or δαιμονιος, from which is derived our word *demon*. This, again, is

never applied to Satan. He is of an entirely distinct order from these. The words should never be confounded, as they are in our translation. The Bible knows no devils any more than it knows a plurality of true Gods. There is one God and one devil; and as God has His angels, so the devil has his demons. If all the evil works attributed to Satan, the persecution of the saints, the tempting of believers, etc., were virtually the work of the devil, that would at once render him omnipresent—possessing one of the attributes of Deity. But such is not the case. He works by means, by instrumentalities which he has put into operation with the ultimate object of man's ruin; such as poisoning the fountains of nature, by which they yield thorns and thistles instead of joy and happiness, and seizing upon a multitude of impure spirits to carry out his will and fulfil his plans, as in the case now before us. We see this verified in the expressive Greek word δαιμονιζόμενος —literally *endemonized.*

It is this principle of satanic instrumentality, whether in nature or the human breast, that has led many who are not over scrupulous as to the divine authenticity of God's Word to suppose that there is no personal devil, but only a corrupt and vicious influence, which may more properly be expressed in our language by spelling the word without a "d," *evil.* This is similar to the view of the Swedenborgians, who teach (if I mistake not) that, as man is at the head of the creation, he is a combination of all the lower orders of creation, and consequently the nature of the serpent, as well as that of the lion

and the lamb, together with that of all other animals, concentrate in him; consequently, when the serpent tempted Eve in the Garden of Eden, that there was no literal serpent present, but that it was her own *serpent* nature which reasoned with her higher and more noble qualities; and as this nature was more astute and cunning than all these, she was induced to yield, and partake of the forbidden fruit.

But this attempted solution of the question encounters too many difficulties to be satisfactory. If such had been the case, Christ would never have conversed with these unclean spirits as though they were personal beings. He would not converse in this way to a serpent nature. After the temptation, we are told that the devil left Him. Did this serpent nature come and go at will? I admit that there are passages in the sacred writings where this mode of interpretation is applicable; but then, these are exceptional cases, and all come under the general principles of Scripture usage, just as in the case recorded in Mark i. 23, where the demoniac came εν πνευματι ακθαρεω, *in* an unclean spirit, just as those who have the Christic spirit dwelling in them are said to be *in* Christ, whereas the sequel proves that the unclean spirit *dwelt in* the man, and *went out* of him. In the book of Revelation, Satan is spoken of as the "great dragon," the beast, and the false prophet (Rev. xii. 9); the first being his power in the pagan world, by which he seeks to destroy the Church; the second by his political dominion over her, by which he would crush her; and the third, his power in sowing dissension in the Church.

These three great powers—pagan, political, and ecclesiastical—when resolved into their proper elements, are but great masses of living men, influenced more or less by Satan, and out of which proceeds an evil influence called the "spirits of devils [demons]," somewhat different from the demons themselves, who are represented as dwelling in the demoniac. When the mission of the men comprising the latter two of these three great powers is ended, they are represented as being cast into a lake burning with fire and brimstone, (Rev. xix. 19,) while Satan himself—the king over the locusts which ascended from the pit of the abyss, and who actuates these powers—is cast personally into the lake where the beast and the false prophets are. The Scriptures attribute personality to Satan as much as they do to Christ. He is called a king, and a king can only be an individual, and not a power or influence. Satan has his subjects, and these are demons and wicked men. The former are spoken of as instruments, entering into and controlling the latter; while unrepentant men are spoken of as worshipping demons. (Rev. ix. 20; 1 Cor. x. 20.)

The terms applied to these evil spirits in the Scriptures are significant. "Satan" and "devil" appear be synonymous. The former means *an enemy*, *an accuser*. Apollyon and Abaddon mean *the destroyer*. Beelzebub is the "prince of blue flies," probably an epithet given in derision by the Jews, on account of the vast number of these insects which gathered around heathen altars and idols, to feast upon the offal and filth allowed to accumulate about these

places, producing disease and death; while on the other hand, the Jews were extremely careful to burn up all filth, and destroy every thing contaminating, thus keeping their temple and altars perfectly pure and clean. The word "devil" is a compound word, consisting of διὰ—*through*, and βάλω—*to cast*, and means the one who pierces through, or wounds with a dart. (Eph. vi. 16.)

The term "demon," in its origin and pagan use, signifies *the spirit of an illustrious dead man;* and the word was applied to heathen gods, who were supposed to have been originally great men on earth, and afterwards gods in heaven. Such were Mars, the god of war; Vulcan, god of fire, formerly an illustrious Roman blacksmith; Venus, the goddess of love; and Neptune, the god of the sea, formerly an illustrious Roman mariner; and so with all others who, while on earth, were notorious for some peculiarity, had been transferred to heaven after death, where they became gods. The Athenians, in speaking of St. Paul's doctrines, use the word in this way, "He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange demons." (Acts xvii. 18.)

According to the book of Henoch, the demons were the souls of the giants who corrupted themselves with the daughters of men in antediluvian times, and who were permitted to wander about the earth; and the idea appears to have been quite prevalent, that the demons which exerted such extraordinary influence and power in our Savior's time were the spirits of dead men. (*Josephus, Bell. Jud.*,

Book 7, *Chap.* 6, *Sec.* 3.) This view I feel very much inclined to accept.

But why not accept the almost universal doctrine, that Satan and his angels were created angels of purity and light in heaven, and that they fell from their lofty abode by sinning against God—filled with an extraordinary pride, they rebelled against His authority, and were cast down to hell? I answer that I cannot accept it, because it appears to me to be a modern invention, and has no authority in Scripture. It was not entertained by the early Church, and appears to be based entirely upon the interpretations of modern expositors. I know that there are passages of Scripture given in proof, but I feel convinced that a careful examination of these passages will show that they yield no testimony in favor of such a claim.

But before entering upon this examination, let us consider for a moment the meaning and use of the word "*angel.*" In the original Greek (for the word is transferred, and not translated), it simply means "*a messenger*," who carries news or valuable packages from one place to another. In the Scriptures the word has two meanings: *celestial messengers* —Christ and sinless spirits; and *terrestrial messengers* —men who carry messages to their fellowmen. The angels of the seven churches, spoken of in Revelation, were men, and the word there might properly be translated, "the ministers or messengers to the seven churches." A similar use of the word occurs in Luke: "And when the angels of John were departed." (Luke vii. 24.) Glancing at the nineteenth

verse, we see that these angels were two of John's disciples; and in the twenty-seventh verse of the same chapter the word is applied to John himself, and translated in our version "*messenger.*"

A similar word occurs in the Old Testament, and is applied to those illustrious Jews whom God had chosen as His especial messengers, by delivering to them His word, to administer to His ancient people. "Thou shalt not revile the *gods*, nor curse the ruler of thy people." (Ex. xxii. 28.) "God standeth in the congregation of the mighty; He judgeth among the *gods.* * * * * I have said, Ye are *gods;* and all of you are children of the Most High." (Ps. lxxxii.) Christ, referring to these passages, gives us the undoubted meaning. They were men—messengers to whom God had given His word. "Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods? If He called them gods unto whom the word of God came, and the Scriptures cannot be broken; say ye of Him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest, because I said, I am the Son of God?" (John x. 34–36.) Stephen calls these gods *angels*: "Who have received the law by the disposition of angels, and have not kept it." (Acts vii. 53.) Paul also calls them *angels:* "For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward." (Heb. ii. 2.) Now, if these angels included all the shepherds of Israel, the priest, Levite, scribe, and Pharisee, the sun, moon and stars of the prophecies, those who had received the word to teach to others,

but had not only failed to do so, but had neglected to keep it themselves, as well as those who had been faithful in the discharge of their duties, then I can easily understand how they might become "fallen angels, reserved under chains of darkness to the judgment of the great day;" and over whom Satan reigns supreme, and whom he controls at will. And there must have been many such in Judea the night that wise men came from Jerusalem inquiring where the new King was to be born. They had received the word, but were so far fallen that not even the priests in the temple could render an answer until they had examined the sacred records.

We are now prepared to examine the first and most important passage of Scripture brought forward as proof that the devil and his angels are fallen celestial angels, that of 2 Peter, ii. 4. In the first chapter of this epistle, Peter is speaking of the way in which the prophecy came. They (the apostles) had been "eye witnesses" of Christ Himself; but we have God's word, which came to us, not "by the will of man, but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Ghost;" then, in the second chapter, he speaks of "false prophets and false teachers," who deny the Master that bought them, and immediately adds, "For if God spared not the angels (these false prophets) when they sinned." This gives us a better understanding of Hebrew ii. 3. If these false prophets are reserved in Tartarus in caverns of darkness unto the judgment day, "how shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?" If such was the fate of false teachers under the old dispensation,

what will be ours under the new if we follow their example? Christ says that he that believeth not on the Son of God is condemned already; and I understand that, at the hour of death, being part and parcel of either the beast or false prophet, they will at once go to perdition. (Rev. xix. 20.) Paul says that "we shall judge angels." (1 Cor. vi. 3.) If this passage refers to celestial spirits, its meaning is an incomprehensible mystery to me; but if it refers to angels under the old dispensation, who kept not their first estate, then it becomes perfectly transparent, and I can easily understand how the sanctified (not martyrs) shall sit on thrones with Christ through the thousand years of the *Parousia*, and in the end be found as participants with Christ in judging the twelve tribes of Israel, including these fallen angels. (Rev. xx.) I repeat, that I cannot understand how we can judge celestial spirits, of the extent and power of whose sins we can form no idea, especially as such spirits, if there are any fallen, have no Savior, and consequently can have no judgment, being already condemned. A thousand years residence in the personal presence (*Parousia*) of Christ, will enable man to judge by the law of Moses the deeds done in the flesh. But by what law can he judge celestial spirits? Certainly not by the law of Moses, created and adapted to man while in the body.

The second passage, "And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, He hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day," (Jude 6.) undoubtedly refers to the same order of beings, and

is so similar to the first that further comment here is unnecessary.

The third passage, "How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! how art thou cut down to the ground, which did weaken the nations" (Isa. xiv. 12), is a sad misquotation. The prophecy is about the king of Babylon: "Take up this proverb against the king of Babylon, and say, How hath the oppressor ceased! the golden city ceased!" (vs. 4.) The word Lucifer means a *light bearer*, and was applied to the morning star—a very fit title for the king of Babylon—a false prophet, who had within his grasp abundant knowledge and power to instruct the nations, but instead of doing so, oppressed them in order that he might gratify his own pride. Nothing is said about his falling *out of* heaven, but that he had said *in his heart*, "I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God." The stars of God were the true prophets of Israel. From this lofty position the king of Babylon was thrown down. Similar language was used in respect to Tyrus. (Ezek. xxviii. 11–19.) I know that it is said that the king of Babylon was a type of Satan. Very well, but that does not destroy the analogy. If Nebuchadnezzar was cast down from a lofty position on earth, so was Satan—nothing more. Christ's remark to the seventy, on their return, is of a similar nature, "I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven." The theatre of his fall was Judea, and no more proves that he fell *out of* heaven than that the lightning falls out of it.

We now come to the last and most important of these passages, that recorded in the twelfth chapter of Revelation; and here all difficulty at once disappears, if we but remember the prophetic nature of the passage, and apply the proper key to its interpretation. *Heaven* is the sanctified Church on earth, overshadowing the Jewish church before Christ's resurrection. The earth is the visible kingdom of disciples. The angels are the *messengers* of God's word. They cannot be celestial spirits, because they overcame the enemy by Christ's blood and the word of their testimony. Celestial angels have nothing to do with the blood of Christ. To overcome Satan by the word of their testimony is the labor of earthly, and not celestial, angels. Had they been celestial and immortal spirits, it would never have been said of them that "they loved their lives unto the death." Earthly messengers lay down their lives for the cause of Christ, but celestial spirits cannot do this.

Again, is it possible that the first sin was committed in heaven? Until this war took place, he had been accusing the brethren day and night, perhaps for ages. The angels had enjoyed no rest, and this, too, in the very presence of God. According to this view, heaven must have been a perfect hell, while the inhabitants of the earth were enjoying during this period as perfect a heaven. According to the record elsewhere, Satan appeared to the first members of our race in Paradise, and continued to be their tempter and accuser from that on; but according to this view he is suddenly cast to the earth, with a vast multitude of his companions, the earth having already

been peopled for ages, and up to this time enjoying perfect tranquillity. The battle here was begun at the cross. Christ is its leader. Michael and his angels is synonymous to Christ and his ministers. The war began on the cross, and extends through all the ramifications of the human family. It is internal, and not external. When Satan loses control over a human soul, that soul becomes a sanctified believer. Satan may continue to persecute him, but he cannot destroy him.

Thus we find that there is no evidence in Scripture that Satan was ever an angel of light in heaven. This view, it must be admitted, destroys much poetry; but as it is truth, and not poetry, we are in search of, we do not feel alarmed. And now the question arises, Where did Satan have his origin? From whence did he come? This is a delicate subject, and one which I shall not attempt to answer. I can only throw out a few suggestions, which may lead us to further research, and in the end prove profitable; as I have good reason to suppose that the Bible contains much on this subject which we have not yet learned. I suggest, that he was created a pure and holy being in this lower world, and, like all the rest of the creation of God, he was pronounced "very good" at the beginning. He was created the ruler of this world. In the temptation the devil is represented as taking Jesus up into a high mountain (probably Cæsar's throne), and showing Him "all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time"; and then he said to Him: "All this power will I give Thee, and the glory of them; for that it is de-

livered unto me, and to whomsoever I will I give it. If Thou, therefore, wilt worship me, all shall be Thine." (Luke iv. 5–7.) On this passage Rev. H. B. Pratt makes the following suggestive remarks: "It will not do to say that this was altogether an impudent falsehood; for had it been so, our Lord would never have suffered it to pass. There was doubtless a foundation in fact for that extraordinary claim, maintained so fearlessly of denial in that extraordinary Presence; but just what it was we can but remotely conjecture. Our Savior does not gainsay, but seems rather to admit, that there was some truth in his claim. He seems to allow that all *had once been delivered to him* (in his 'first estate,' perhaps, as a prince over the hosts of God); but implies that the baseness of his proposal showed that whatever legal claim he once may have possessed he had utterly forfeited, by his impious endeavor to wrest it from his Lord and Maker, his Lawgiver and his Judge." (*H. B. Pratt, Studies on the Second Advent.*)

Christ's own language appears to be decisive on this point: "Now is the judgment of this world; now shall the prince of this world be cast out." (John xii. 31.) "Hereafter I will not talk much with you; for the prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in Me." (John xiv. 30.) Our Savior here does not intimate that Satan has assumed this position, or that he has stolen this title, but that it is truly and legitimately his own. The indications, then, are that Satan was created a prince of this world, pure and holy, and with complete control

over the world and all its elements, even from the beginning of the creation. This view, I think, will appear more evident if we now examine Ezekiel's prophecy against Tyrus. (Ezek. chap. xxviii.) This prophecy appears to refer more directly to the high priest of the temple at Jerusalem—a high, *strong rock* in the midst of the seas (understanding the word *seas* in its prophetic sense, of Gentile nations). He is a man, and not a god (vs. 2). He was full of wisdom and perfect in beauty, and had been in Eden, the garden of God. Every precious stone was his covering,—referring, no doubt, to the breastplate worn by the high priest. (Ex. xxviii. 15–21.) He was the anointed cherub, the second of the four "living creatures" of Rev. iv. 6. This I consider to be undoubted proof as to whom the prophecy refers. The word "cherub" could never be applied to the uncircumcised king of any heathen nation. He had dwelt in Mount Zion, the holy mountain of God; had beheld the glory of the Shekinah, and had administered upon the holy altars. Born of the tribe of Levi, chosen from birth for a pure and holy service, he had dwelt from his creation in God's holy temple on earth. He was perfect in all his ways, until iniquity was found in him, and then he was cast down from this lofty position. He signed his own death-sentence when he delivered the Lord Jesus over to Pontius Pilate to be crucified, and his final destruction became complete with the destruction of the temple and temple-service. But I do not intend to say that Tyrus was a type of the high priest, but the apostate priest himself. The word

Tyrus means a *strong rock, a refuge*, and as such was placed in Sion as a refuge for God's people, but failing in the fulfilment of his mission, he sold the flock; and then the Lord says of them: "Where are their gods [angels?], their *rock* in whom they trusted, which did eat the fat of their sacrifices, and drank the wine of their drink offerings?" (Deut. xxxii. 37, 38.) All, then, that is said of Tyrus may more or less figuratively be said of Satan. He was created in this world for the especial purpose of being the prince and ruler—the great high priest of this world. Had he remained faithful to his Creator, he would have had the whole race of Adam, unfallen and uncontaminated with sin, for his subjects. His authority, it is true, would have been delegated authority, and subject to God; but it would have been true, pure, holy, and happy. But there appear to be evidences that his fall occurred in the early stages of creation, long before man was formed, or he had a subject to rule over. Created a prince of this world, he had full control over all the elements of nature, instilling into them the influence of his poison; consequently that which God made and pronounced "very good," became, under the influence of Satan, foul and impure, producing thorns and thistles and tormenting diseases. The very first intimation we have of Satan's existence was, "And the earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep." This was chaos, confusion. Can any one look upon this picture and not exclaim, "An enemy hath done this"? Yet the life-giving Spirit of God continued to brood over this chaos,

bringing forth life and light from confusion and darkness.

When the time came for man's creation, we find that, although he was created of earth's poisoned elements, he was not altogether placed in the world a subject of the prince of this world, but was hedged in by a paradise of God's own planting; and in order that Satan might reach him, he had to leave his own domain and intrude himself into God's paradise; but it appears that even this was contaminated by his evil influence before man was placed in it. The tree of the "knowledge of good and evil" was there. *Good* came from God, but the *evil* from the enemy. This tree, then, was formed from the elements of Satan's world. The idea that Satan instilled his poison into the very elements as the world itself was being created, filling it with that which would produce pain, suffering and death, leaving everywhere his testimony of universal death in every mountain and in every rock, from the shell of the most minute mollusk up to the giant skeletons of the megathereum and glyptodon, the mastodon and the dynothereum, poisoning all the fountains of nature, so that they produce thorns, briers, thistles, venomous reptiles and insects, tormenting, tearing, teasing, annoying, not only the future race of man, but enemies to each other as well, appears to me to be far more consistent than the idea that Satan fell from the condition of a pure and holy angel into a world where there was nothing but universal joy and peace and happiness, transforming it into earth's present condition, and that, too, without any authority from Him who

created the world good at the first. That God should confer upon him such authority *after* his fall appears to me to be utterly inconsistent with His justice, love and mercy. That Satan was created a pure and holy being in this world, with full control over the elements, and that here he created rebellion by first rebelling himself against God's authority, and then filling the earth with the elements of sorrow and death, and afterwards, when man was created, he succeeded in persuading a large portion of the race to follow his example, subjecting the remainder to the evil influences which he had put in operation in nature, as well as inspiring his own ill-gotten subjects by their evil passions to engage also with him in subjecting them to tormenting persecutions, appears to me to be perfectly consistent with the word of God, as well as with the laws of nature, and avoids all the difficulties which arise from the view that "the devil and his angels" were created in a world where sin can never enter.

If the views which I have here presented are correct, then the "demons" of the passage under consideration—the devil's angels—are the spirits of false prophets and teachers under the old dispensation. Let us examine the record. Notice the residence of this possessed of demons, "the tombs." They dwelt in "the region and shadow of death." Modern travellers tell us that there are many tombs cut out of the rocks on the hillsides in the country where this miracle was supposed to have taken place. These tombs, full of dead men's bones, were an unclean place for a ceremonially pure Jew. The Jews

were accustomed, as far as possible, to keep these tombs in good repair and well whitened, so that they could be seen from a distance, and avoided by going around them. They even considered that a person would be defiled walking over a tomb that had been hid for ages; and for this reason Jewish women going to the synagogue rode on oxen, in order that their feet might not touch the ground, if it was necessary to pass over such places. No Jews, only Gentiles, would live in Tiberias—a city that Herod built—because it was built on the site of an old grave yard. (*Giekie's Life of Christ*, Vol. I., page 301.) If accidentally polluted by passing over a grave, they remained unclean seven days, and during this time could enter no house or synagogue. The tombs, then, being the residence of these unclean spirits, were significant of their impurity and uncleanness. And then the entry of this legion of demons into a herd of unclean swine, which to the Jew was the most unclean of all animals, is in harmony with the residence chosen by these unclean spirits.

Now look at the number—"a legion." This is supposed to be about four thousand. Luke tells us that there were about two thousand swine, and that would afford about two demons to each hog. But mind the small place in which they had dwelt—four thousand of them in one heart.

"*I adjure Thee by God that Thou torment me not.*" Trench, commenting upon these words, says: "Herein the true devilish spirit speaks out, which counts it a torment not to be suffered to torment others. If

it were a torment to these demons not to be able to retain this man among the unclean tombs, then what a torment it must be to them to know that the saints are safe in holiness and heaven? But Matthew records what appears to be a question to Jesus before this request is made, "Art Thou come to torment us before the *time?*" What time do they refer to? Is this *time* the day of judgment? I think not. I think that it is that time when Christ should triumph over the enemy on the cross, and Satan should be expelled from the Jewish Church, or kingdom of heaven, and this Church should now become Christian. If so, I can easily understand how these demons may be the spirits of the wicked dead who had been false prophets among the Jews, and who, from the hour of the death of their bodies up to this period, were permitted to roam about the earth (land of Judea), and find a residence wherever they could; but after this period were either limited to the pagan world, or confined in dungeons of darkness unto the judgment of the great day. This, again, brings us back to the twelfth chapter of Revelation, which may be paraphrased thus: "And there was war in the spiritual kingdom of heaven. Christ and His disciples fought against the dragon. And the dragon fought, and his angels—demons and wicked men. And the dragon was cast out, and his angels were cast out with him. Woe to those who dwell on the earth (the discipleship of the Church) and the sea (pagan world); for the devil is come down unto you." After this battle, it is the devil who is come down to the earth. Nothing is said

about his angels or these demons having come with him. They are now confined in dungeons of darkness, while his other instrumentalities are all left him wherewith to torment those who have not as yet become members of the sanctified Church.

Then another important point is the intimate relation which this miracle bears to that of the quelling of the tempest, immediately preceding it. If we suppose the ship to represent the Jewish Church, and the sea the pagan world, which had exerted its utmost power to ruin and destroy the Church before our Savior came, we will again see the connecting link here. Satan, using Pharaoh as his instrument, had endeavored to destroy Israel's Savior in Egypt, by destroying the male children of the Hebrews. But the Savior was not to come at that time, and the prophet like unto Christ who did come, was miraculously preserved. He again used Herod as an instrumentality for the accomplishment of the same purpose, and again he was defeated, and the Messiah still lives. Another attempt was made by the great enemy, in the temptation, to gain Him by deceit and cunning, and this also had failed. Now Satan finds Him asleep with His disciples on the sea of Galilee, and seizing those material elements at his command—the wind and the waves, typical of those more spiritual elements which he has used in later ages, and which he now uses for the ruin of Christ's Church—he hurled down upon Him from the mountains such a tempest as he supposed would engulf and destroy Him in the deep; but like all his other efforts, this also proved a failure; for Jesus, although

He had not yet conquered and mastered the great enemy, was already Lord of the elements, and could control them at will, thus bringing peace and calm out of the storm, as He in the beginning had brought new life out of chaos and death. And now He meets with this legion of evil spirits. How natural to suppose that He would take revenge on them for what had occurred on the night before! We are not surprised, then, that they should exclaim, "Art Thou come to torment us before the time?" the time when Satan should be seen falling "like lightning from heaven;" his power broken, his dominion destroyed, and all power in heaven and earth given to Christ. (Matt. xviii. 18.) For some time these demons and other powers of Satan's kingdom had been all in turmoil, exerting an influence which they never did before nor since; but their power was subject to Him who controls, not only the elements of earth, but the demons of hell, and brings calm and peace after the storm.

Mark says that the demons "besought Him that He would not send them away out of the *country;*" that is, out of the kingdom of Israel, confining their power to the heathen world. Luke says, "They besought Him that He would not command them to go out into the *deep;*" that is, into the *abyss.* The words *sea* and *abyss* appear to be synonymous, and doubtless in prophetic language mean the heathen world, although they appear to have, and I think we can say they do have, a more significant meaning still; that is, the condition of "those who sit in the region and shadow of death." During the *Parou-*

sia, or Millenium, Satan, as a persecuting power, is limited to that region. (Rev. xx. 1–3.) It was from thence that he first came as a persecuting *political power*. (Rev. xvii. 8; xi. 7.) Satan is spoken of as being the angel of this abyss; and it appears to be Satan's own camping ground, as the Septuagint translates "the deep" of Gen. i. 2 by this word. Within this abyss there appears to be a *pit*. (Rev. ix. 1, 2.) The idea at once suggests itself to the mind that this pit is the grave in the heathen world—origin of the dense, dark smoke of fear and superstition which covers the earth with worse than Egyptian darkness in regard to the future world and future condition of the race, resulting in ruining the world with an immense army of spiritual locusts, demons, evil spirits and false gods. The word "pit" again suggests this idea, as it is used elsewhere to designate the grave. Out of the grave shall also come life. When Christ sat by the side of Jacob's well, and conversed with the woman of Samaria, she said, "The pit is deep, and You have not wherewith to draw." Although the carnal Jacob may dig deep, yet out of his grave Christ can draw living water. This word *abyss* is also found in Rom. x. 7, "Who shall descend into the abyss? (that is, to bring Christ up from the dead.)" Only the power of the living God could bring Christ up from the grave.

When, therefore, the demons request of Christ that He would not command them to go out into the deep, I understand that they request of Him that they may still be permitted to roam this earth, and that they would not be confined to the pit of dark-

ness in the abyss,—just what befell them upon their entry into the unclean swine.

King James' Version says, "The Lord hath made all things for Himself; yea, even the *wicked* for the day of evil." (Prov. xvi. 4.) One of my Spanish versions reads, "*The wicked one.*" That God should create evil, as evil, appears to me to be fully as inconsistent as to say that He created the devil as a devil. That God created him pure and holy, a prince of this world, and that he rebelled, and became the author of all the evil in the world, appears to be far more consistent with the Divine plan. Satan then seduced the sons of Adam, and these in turn became, after death, evil spirits or demons. But Dr. Hodge opposes the idea that these demons, so numerous and so rampant in our Savior's time, were the spirits of dead men. He says, "that the *δαιμονια*, who are represented as subject to Satan, are not the spirits of wicked men who have departed this life, as some have maintained, is clear, (1), Because they are distinguished from the elect angels; (2), From its being said that they kept not their first estate (Jude 6); (3), From the language of 2 Peter, ii. 4, where it is said God spared not the angels that sinned; (4), From the application to them of the titles, principalities and powers, which are appropriate only to beings belonging to the order of angels." (*Hodge, Vol. I, p.* 644.) The answer to the first objection is very simple. That there are "elect angels" (1 Tim. v. 21,) no more proves that there are non-elect angelic spirits who have fallen, than that "elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by

Christ." *Confession of Faith*, chapter 10, section 3, proves that there are *non*-elect infants dying in infancy who are not regenerated and saved by Christ. His second and third objections have already been refuted. In answer to the fourth, I would say, that the principalities and powers (Eph. vi. 11–13; Col. ii. 15,) referred to all the powers of darkness *at present* in operation in this world, and intimates nothing whatever in regard to their origin. I must have stronger proof than Dr. Hodge presents before I can be convinced that his view is correct.

Matthew says that "there was, *a good way off* from them, a herd of swine feeding," and Luke adds, they were "on the mountains." We are not told the length of time that elapsed from their exit from the man to their entrance into the swine, but the impression is that it was but a moment. Nor are we told whether or not the air was the means of their conveyance. Satan is called the prince of the power of the air, (Eph. ii. 2,) probably because this is the instrument by which he conveys his instrumentalities, and not because the air is the residence of evil spirits, as is usually supposed. We notice that the air was the principal instrument chosen by Satan to destroy the Sleeper and His small band on the night before; and as the wind is the symbol of the Spirit, it also becomes a symbol of all similar instrumentality in teaching and propagating doctrines; an instrument which the enemy does not fail to use to his advantage in the propagation of his false doctrines.

The infidels have raised a great dust about the wanton destruction of so much private property as

was destroyed by the loss of two thousand head of swine by our Lord Jesus Christ. To this cavil I answer, that the Jew who would violate the laws of his country, and pollute it, in order to enrich himself by pampering to a foreign appetite, ought to be punished *far worse* than by the loss of his property. If the owners of these hogs were not Jews, they had no business there, and should have been banished as knaves and traitors. But I deny that it was the Lord Jesus who destroyed these pork-loving Jews' property. It was the infidels' own friends, the demons themselves, who destroyed the two thousand hogs. Let them give an account of them.

Now, I will only add, by way of conclusion, that there are three prayers offered to Jesus in the latter part of this narrative. (1), The demons "besought," or prayed, to Him, that they might be permitted to enter into the herd of swine. This prayer was granted, and, like Pharoah and his host, they plunged madly into the sea or abyss, henceforth to lose all control over the citizens of the kingdom of God. (2), The Gadarenes besought (prayed to Him) to retire from their coasts. This prayer also was granted. A few herd of swine was of far more value to them than God's eternal King and kingdom. It would never do for them to be cleansed from their filthy traffic, and sit, like the healed man, clothed in purity and holiness, at the feet of Jesus. (3), The prayer of the healed man to be with Jesus was refused. He must return to his filthy countrymen, and preach the gospel to them. Christ would not take him home to the bosom of His kingdom

now; but he must labor towards the salvation of others, until the Master, in His own good time, calls him home.

Reader, you, by your life, are offering one of these three prayers to-day. Which is it? Do you pray, with the demons, to be permitted to become still more filthy? Or with the Gadarenes, that Christ may depart from you for ever? Or do you pray, with Christ's chosen one, that you may be permitted to dwell with Him in purity and holiness?

We have in this miracle a bold outline of the sad condition of the world. A few masterly touches here, in sharp relief, present to our minds the sad condition of our humanity. The man filled with a legion of demons is a type of one who has felt the power and polluting influence of sin to the uttermost, and has learned that he has no power within himself to break away from it; consequently can see before him no ray of hope, but only the consciousness of final and irretrievable ruin. For all such there is no Savior but Christ. The chains of the law and the fetters of the prophetic dispensation may bind him for a time; but they only gall and lacerate, until they are all broken, and the poor, lost sinner is impelled by an irresistible force to return to his filthy dwelling-place amid the rotting carcases of the tomb. Oh! how sad! And yet his countrymen are all in the same terrible condition. The only difference is that they do not know it, and he does. Their sins are to them what the swine were to the people of Gadara. They were their pets, their property, their riches, their wealth, that by which they

gained their living, and possibly, like the Gentile governors of the land, their food—at least they exchanged them for what was their food. The demons were within the man; the swine, it is true, were outside of his neighbors, and yet the care and attention bestowed upon them proves that they had found an abiding-place in their hearts. His eyes had been opened, and, like Adam and Eve, he found himself lost. Their eyes would have been opened, also, if they had, like him, felt the galling, binding chains and fetters of Moses and the prophets. A sad example of this poor man is to be found to-day in the drunkard, who is the miserable, abject slave of his cups. His neighbors who keep the swine are the rumsellers, who carry on an abominable business, which sends their neighbors, sons and daughters down to the abyss. Throughout public and private life, wherever we go, we find this same sad state of affairs. The poor demoniac, who from childhood has been drilled in deception, falsehood, and dishonesty, in order to gain a livelihood, or carry on a respectable, profitable, and what the world would call a legitimate business, and who feels the terrible condemnation and dreads the retribution already about to fall upon him for breaking God's pure and holy law, suffers in terrible agony until he comes to Jesus and is healed; while his neighbor, on the other hand, practises all these things, grows rich, lives in ease and luxury, and dies, and is laid away in the dwelling-place of demons, the filthy tombs, the awful abyss in which his riches, and his honor and glory have perished for ever;—or have these, like

the swine impelled by unclean spirits, passed over there, to become tormenting demons, to rend and tear him throughout eternity? Jesus can save him; but his inordinate love of his pets, his houses and lands, his soul and body destroying business, his uncleanness and unbounded selfishness, induce him to fall at the feet of the Savior whom the God of the universe has provided for fallen man, and pray that He would depart out of his coasts—leave him in his ruin for ever; and now, passing beyond, he will find that what was to him a herd of swine here, is transformed into a legion of tormenting demons.

JAIRUS' DAUGHTER RAISED, AND THE ISSUE OF BLOOD STOPPED.

"And, behold, there cometh one of the rulers of the synagogue, Jairus by name; and when he saw Him, he fell at His feet, and besought Him greatly, saying, My little daughter lieth at the point of death: I pray Thee, come and lay Thy hands on her, that she may be healed; and she shall live And Jesus went with him; and much people followed Him, and thronged Him. And a certain woman, which had an issue of blood twelve years, and had suffered many things of many physicians, and had spent all that she had, and was nothing bettered, but rather grew worse, when she had heard of Jesus, came in the press behind, and touched His garment. For she said, If I may touch but his clothes, I shall be whole. And straightway the fountain of her blood was dried up; and she felt in her body that she was healed of that plague. And Jesus, immediately knowing in Himself that virtue had gone out of Him, turned Him about in the press, and said, Who touched My clothes? And His disciples said unto Him, Thou seest the multitude thronging Thee, and sayest Thou, Who touched me? And He

looked round about to see her that had done this thing. But the woman fearing and trembling, knowing what was done in her, came and fell down before Him, and told Him all the truth. And He said unto her, Daughter, thy faith hath made thee whole; go in peace, and be whole of thy plague. While He yet spake, there came from the ruler of the synagogue's house certain which said, Thy daughter is dead; why troublest thou the Master any further? As soon as Jesus heard the word that was spoken, He saith unto the ruler of the synagogue, Be not afraid, only believe. And He suffered no man to follow Him, save Peter, and James, and John the brother of James. And He cometh to the house of the ruler of the synagogue, and seeth the tumult, and them that wept and wailed greatly. And when He was come in, He saith unto them, Why make ye this ado, and weep? the damsel is not dead, but sleepeth. And they laughed Him to scorn. But when He had put them all out, He taketh the father and the mother of the damsel, and them that were with Him, and entereth in where the damsel was lying. And He took the damsel by the hand, and said unto her, Talitha cumi; which is, being interpreted, Damsel, (I say unto thee,) arise. And straightway the damsel arose, and walked; for she was of the age of twelve years. And they were astonished with a great astonishment. And He charged them straitly that no man should know it; and He commanded that something should be given her to eat."—MARK v. 22–43.

WE have two miracles recorded in this passage, of such intimate relationship that it is impossible to separate them without destroying the lesson which they were intended to teach. If we apply the rules of interpretation which I have used thus far, the lesson becomes very easy, and at the same time quite instructive.

"*And, behold, there came one of the rulers of the synagogue, Jairus by name.*" By a ruler of the synagogue, I understand a person who occupied a position in the Jewish church quite similar to that of a gospel minister under the Christian dispensation.

The synagogue was the Jewish church, and has virtually come down to us. The temple and temple service, being more directly typical of Christ and His work, has all passed away—fulfilled in Him. But why is this ruler's name so carefully stated here? Doubtless to farther designate the position he occupied. The word "Jairus" means *a dispenser of light.* How very appropriate! Was it human ingenuity which gave him this name, or is it part of a divine record?

"*And he besought Him greatly, saying, My little daughter lieth at the point of death.*" The original is still more emphatic, and the expression "my little daughter" might with propriety be translated "*my dear little daughter.*" But who is this daughter in the antitype, over whose salvation the Christian minister is so solicitous? We notice that in the record it was not the wife and mother who was sick and dying, but the daughter, the former being apparently healthy and well. The daughter, then, can be no other than the baptized child of the church—she who had sat from infancy under the light of the synagogue, and who had now arrived at a point when she could know good from evil, being twelve years of age. But the solicitous care of the father and mother had failed to preserve their darling child from sickness and death. Human instrumentality cannot save from death; they must bring her to Jesus. In the prophetic language of the Old Testament this daughter is spoken of as "the daughter of Sion," and "the daughter of Jerusalem." (Jer. xlix. 4; Micah iv. 8–10; Zeph. iii. 14–20; Zech. ix. 9.) If

we examine these prophecies we will find a perfect analogy running through them corresponding with this miracle, as well as with events recorded in the parable of the prodigal son, and proves that there is no power in the old dispensation that can save. Christ, and Christ alone, is the only Savior from sin. Luke states that she was an *only* daughter; but this does not prove that all baptized children will be raised from sin by Christ. Mark states that he was *one of* the rulers of the synagogue, with which the original of Matthew nearly agrees, indicating that there were more than one, and that there may have been several rulers of this same synagogue; but that it was the dispenser of light whose strong faith in Jesus was the instrumentality which in the end resulted in a cure. The other rulers of the synagogue may have had daughters also, who had not profited by the instructions imparted by their fathers, and not brought to Christ by a father's faith, may have, and according to the Old Testament prophecies, really did perish in their sins.

A discrepancy between Matthew and the other evangelists, in King James' Version, may be noticed here: "My daughter is even now dead." The word "even" may be translated *possibly*. She was alive when he left home, but is possibly now dead. This would harmonize Matthew with the statements of Mark and Luke, that she was "at the point of death" when he left his house.

"*Come and lay Thy hands on her, that she may be healed; and she shall live.*" From the peculiar construction of this language, as well as the intimate

relationship existing between this miracle and the one connected with it, I think I see an indication that the disease with which this daughter suffered was one that, according to the Levitical law, would exclude from the synagogue service, and if so, her soul would be considered by him as in danger of eternal death, and that if Christ will restore her to bodily health, he will not only free her from an unclean disease, but give her life of soul also.

"*And Jesus went with him; and much people followed Him, and thronged Him.*" This company that followed Him, and pressed around Him, was doubtless a crowd who followed out of mere curiosity, to see some wonderful sign, just as a crowd to-day would follow a circus, in order to see a clown or dancing bear. Hundreds of people go to church to-day for the same purpose; that is, they go to hear a good preacher, or to be entertained by a good sermon. They would (if it were as respectable) just as soon go to see a bear fight, or anything else, that would entertain them for an hour or two. Oh, how few, how very few, go to church for the sole purpose of learning God's will and putting it into practice!

If you want to learn a very curious lesson in human nature, and one that you will not be likely to forget very soon, place yourself at some convenient street-corner of a country town when a circus company is coming in, and study (not the circus, but) the countenances of the spectators. Look at that open picture of human nature, and you will be able to read every countenance: here, the leering buffoon; there, gaping ignorance; yonder, wondering

curiosity; there, the drunkard, and so on: all bent on seeing some strange and wonderful thing.

Just such a crowd pressed around the burning martyr-fires of Huss and Jerome, of Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, and around the grave of Wickliffe, and saw his bones removed by sacrilegious hands and burned. Such a crowd gathered around the dying Polycarp, and saw him torn limb from limb by wild beasts; and not long after the performance of these miracles, such an one gathered around our Lord Jesus Christ, and saw Him dragged by brutal soldiers to a mock trial and an infamous execution.

But just as in those crowds that gathered around the burning martyrs there may have been some who in the end were of that "remnant that shall be saved," so there was in this crowd that pressed around Jesus on this occasion one at least who was not drawn there out of mere idle curiosity. This person was a woman who had suffered long and severely a disease which had dragged her down almost to the gates of death. Her disease was "an issue of blood"—a disease which, according to the Levitical law, rendered her ceremonially impure, and at once declaring her outside of the synagogue. She was not a daughter of the synagogue. She doubtless had in early youth attended the synagogue service—was healthy, strong, and ceremonially pure; but now for twelve years she had been excluded from the kingdom. The peculiar exactness with which the evangelists state the age of the ruler's daughter, and the length of time with which this woman had suffered this disease, to be twelve years,

leads me to suppose that they were both now in comparatively the same condition. If so, then, in the antitype, the baptized child of the church, who has from tender infancy enjoyed all the privileges of superior religious training, and that person who has received but few of these religious privileges, and has failed to profit by those he has received, and later becomes a wandering prodigal, must both be brought to the same humble position as suppliants at the feet of Jesus before they can be saved.

"*And had suffered many things of many physicians, and had spent all that she had, and was nothing bettered, but rather grew worse.*" In many ancient manuscripts the passage in Luke viii. 43—"had spent all her living upon physicians, etc."—is omitted, but found in more modern manuscripts. This has induced some modern critics, who endeavor to maintain the false and absurd theory that Luke compiled his gospel from Matthew and Mark, to suppose that, Luke being a physician, and extremely modest, did not include these words, but that some modern copyist introduced them from Mark. This woman had learned from sad experience that only the true Physician can heal. These doctors were not all quacks, but they were all ceremonial, legal, and moral, and could do her no good. They could eat up her living, relieve her of her money, and cause her much suffering, but they could not effect a cure. Moses and Elias were true physicians, and their prescriptions were necessary, but their medicines could only touch the ceremonial, legal, and moral. Spirit, if diseased, can alone be cured by a

spiritual physician. False priests and false prophets were abundant in those days, as quacks are to-day; yet she appears to have knowledge enough to avoid all these, and doubtless applied to physicians well skilled in their profession. I find nothing in this passage that would detract in the least from the character and profession of the honorable modern physician. I esteem the medical profession as ranking next to that of the Christian ministry.

In order that we may be saved, we must know by sad experience that we are suffering a terrible malady; our life-blood is flowing away, leaving our body every day weaker, and one day nearer the grave; and that no mortal physician can cure this malady, or stop this flow of life. It is only when we have learned this that we are prepared to come to the great Physician, by a living faith that will save us. This is what this woman did, and there are a few to-day, of all the pretended followers of Christ, who know His power to save. Others follow because the crowd goes that way. Some think that it is a respectable crowd; some follow to sell their merchandise to the multitude; others because they expect to be fed with the loaves and fishes; but it is recorded of this poor woman, that she came because she desired to be healed.

"*When she heard of Jesus, came in the press behind, and touched His garment, for she said, If I may touch but His clothes, I shall be whole.*" Matthew and Luke say, that she touched "the hem" and "border" of His garment. On this passage Godet makes the following remarks: "The word κρασπεδον,

which we translate by *the hem* (of the garment), denotes one of the four tassels or tufts of scarlet woollen cord attached to the four corners of the outer robe, which were intended to remind the Israelites of their law. Their name was *zitzit*, (Num. xv. 38.) As this robe, which was of a rectangular form, was worn like a woman's shawl, two of the corners, being allowed to hang down close together on the back, we see the force of the expression '*came behind.*' Had it been, as is ordinarily understood, the lower hem of the garment which she attempted to touch, she could not have succeeded, on account of the crowd which surrounded Jesus." On this point Alford says: "The κρασπεδον was the fringe or tassel which the Jews were commanded to wear on each corner of their outer garment, as a sign that they were to be holy unto God. The article, as in Matthew xiv. 36, designates the particular tassel which was touched." As the word used in Numbers xv. 38, is *fringes*, I am inclined to think that the fringe of one side, including the tassel of one corner, was what was intended. The mystical number, four, at once designates the four-fold character of God's kingdom, (Rev. iv. 6–7,) as well as the four-fold character of Christ—of King, Priest, Prophet, and Quickening Spirit. This woman had already tried the first three, and had found that they could not cure her. These were the physicians on whom she had wasted her substance. She had lost confidence in the king of Israel. For several hundred years there had been no king, and the nation had been ruled by foreign powers. She had tried the priesthood, but had found

that all the blood shed upon Jewish altars could never atone for sin. She had appealed to the prophets, but all they could do was to point her to the Great Physician, and now she comes to Him. She had already tried three fringes of this garment in vain. Now, if she could only touch the fourth, she would be healed. She comes, and she touches that fourth hem, or fringe, which is peculiarly typical of Christ in the Comforter, His reign in the kingdom of Spirit, and lo! she is healed.

"*And straightway the fountain of her blood was dried up; and she felt in her body that she was healed of that plague.*" The cure was instantaneous. In the very act of touching His garment she was healed. And yet the process which brought her to the feet of Jesus had occupied twelve years.

"*And Jesus, immediately knowing in Himself that virtue had gone out of Him, turned Him about in the press, and said, Who touched My clothes?*" On another occasion we are told that "The whole multitude sought to touch Him, for there went virtue out of Him and healed them all." Now, we cannot for a moment suppose that this virtue went out of Him without His own consent; and yet He tells us that He did nothing of Himself, but the Father, working through Him, did all of these miracles.

He who, by the eye of the Spirit, could see into man's heart, and know when the multitude in thought murmured against Him, who knew Zaccheus before He came to Jericho, and Nathanael when under the fig tree, knew the object of this woman's faith, and granted her request of His own free will.

Some weak minds have supposed that Christ did not know who touched Him, as it would, to them, have been a piece of deception on the part of Jesus to ask His disciples for knowledge which He already possessed, and that He would not thus deceive them. Godet says, "Anything like feigning ignorance ill comports with the candor of His character." I cannot understand it in this way, as we have so many similar examples in the Scriptures; that, for instance, in the example of Elisha and Gehazi, "Whence comest thou, Gehazi?" In this case we are fully assured that Elisha knew all the particulars of Gehazi's transaction before he asked the question. Also, when God called to Adam, "Where art thou, Adam?" The all-wise God certainly knew where Adam was. Again, the case of a father inquiring of his children, who had committed some fault, in order to have them state the truth, "Who did this?" There is no infraction of the truth here. But we have an undoubted example of this from Christ Himself, on another occasion: "And He said unto them, What things? And they said unto Him, Concerning Jesus of Nazareth, which was a prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people." The question was asked of this woman to draw out what followed.

"*And His disciples said unto Him, Thou seest the multitude thronging Thee, and sayest Thou, Who touched Me?*" The disciples appear to be almost, if not altogether, offended that He should ask such a question. They little dreamed that He was the discerner of the thoughts of all hearts. Luke says

that they *all denied.* She may have denied at first. Whether we are to include the woman in the word "all," or only the multitude, is hard to decide. I am rather inclined to think, from a careful examination of the text, that this woman and the disciples are not to be included in the word *all* here. For Luke states that *all denied*, and that Peter and they that were with him made a declaration just the reverse of this—that many had touched Him; thus indicating that it was not a very truth-loving multitude. The word *all*, then, means *all the multitude*, exclusive of the woman and the disciples.

"*The woman came and fell down before Him, and told Him all the truth.*" Christ demanded of this woman just what He demands of every saved sinner —that the moment he knows that his sins have been forgiven, and that life eternal, stolen from him by treachery in Eden by the great enemy of God and man, has now been restored to him, that he should come and make an open confession, and not to hide away in a convent and enjoy the remainder of life in selfish indulgence, but come and glorify his Savior by confessing His power to save before the whole multitude.

"*And He said unto her, Daughter, thy faith hath made thee whole.*" The word "daughter" is a term of endearment, and from the lips of Christ is a declaration that she is now a member of His new kingdom, and virtually belongs to the new dispensation. "Thy faith hath made thee whole," is in the original "Thy faith *hath saved* thee," indicating that she is not only made whole from the polluting disease with

which she had suffered, but that her sins are forgiven her, thus opening up for her the hope of a glorious resurrection."

Now here let us stop and learn a lesson. It is not all those who follow after Christ that will be saved. Hundreds in that noisy, worthless crowd never saw heaven, and hundreds to-day in the church, as worthless as these, will never pass through the gates of pearl.

But we must not forget here that the faith of this woman was not yet fully developed into the faith of the new covenant. It was still under the shadow of the old. She supposed that some magic influence would go out from His person that would cause a cure. She displays here a childish ignorance of the whole gospel plan of salvation as revealed to us to-day. She does not appear to know that He who created man's body must know just where the disease is, and that His healing touch must be applied to the wounded part before there can be any effectual cure. None but God can cure. All through the Old Testament, God's servants never pretended to perform miracles. On the contrary, they ever denied any power as inherent in themselves. The most they ever pretended to was to acknowledge themselves as God's instruments, while they ever attributed the power of the miracle alone to Him who has all power in heaven and in earth. If Christ, as she probably supposed, was a prophet or messenger sent from God, He must know her trouble ere he could heal her. If she could be healed merely by touching the garment of the Great Prophet, then

He must be God, and she could not possibly touch Him without His knowledge.

And yet Christ had mercy on her. Coming thus to Him, in her weak, childish ignorance, putting faith in Him in a manner that to me, with my knowledge of the gospel, would be gross idolatry, our Savior deigns to grant the earnest desire of her heart. But we must remember that she lived under a dispensation of types and shadows, and that now the true worshippers worship the Father in spirit and in truth.

It would appear that this age of shadows did not entirely disappear with the resurrection of our Lord, but was continued down into the times of the apostles; for we read of napkins and handkerchiefs being carried from the apostles to the sick, and even sick persons were laid at the wayside in order that the shadow of the apostles might fall upon them and heal them.

This again proves to us that a knowledge of the whole gospel plan of salvation is not necessary for the salvation of the soul. If it were, no man on earth could be saved. The most pious and the most learned theologian in the world cannot comprehend the whole truth, while in mortal flesh. We cannot know Christ unto perfection in this life. We may, indeed, "feel after Him," as Paul told the Athenians; or like the woman on whom this miracle was performed, we may at least touch the hem of his garment, and if we do that with a living faith that it is He who has come to redeem Israel, we shall be

saved, however imperfect and immature that faith may be.

"*Go in peace.*" A blessing is now pronounced upon her: "Go in peace." We are all, in a spiritual sense, in the condition of this woman. The stream of life is rapidly flowing away. Every day we are one day nearer to the grave, and we can alone be healed by coming to Christ. We cannot, perhaps, be able to lay hold on His divinity, but we can at least touch His humanity. By clothing Himself with human flesh, He has made Himself accessible to us. We touch Him by the arm of faith: "He that believeth on Me shall never die."

And now the evangelist tells us that messengers coming from the house of the ruler of the synagogue inform him that his daughter is dead. Christ, either overhearing this message or not heeding it, said to him, "Be not afraid, only believe." Here faith comes in again; but oh! how different! In the woman's case, it was her own faith that saved her; but in this case, it was the faith of the parent that restored the dead daughter to life.

"*And He suffered no man to follow Him, save Peter, and James, and John the brother of James.*" The three favored disciples were permitted to follow Him into the death-chamber, and catch a glimpse of the wonderful mystery of the resurrection. These three were the representatives of the ministry of the gospel church, corresponding with the twenty-four elders of Rev. iv. 4. They are the representatives of three kingdoms: the law, the gospel, and the Spirit—the carnal, the moral, and the spiritual.

Peter, the *rock*, built upon the foundation, Christ, or in other words, the sub-structure of the edifice; James, the *supplanter*, or main edifice; and John, the embellishments, or life and beauty and grace within, that is, the *grace of God*. Peter, the representative of the legal, and James, whose name means a supplanter, is the representative of the moral or evangelical—the gospel supplanting or taking the place of the law. John does not supplant James, but these two go hand in hand, the gospel and spiritual kingdoms being intimately united to each other; consequently the evangelist is very careful to tell us that John is the brother of James. Peter is also the representative of the ceremonial, and James of the intellectual. From their presence with Christ in the transfiguration, we learn that these three favored disciples are representatives of the last three of the mystic number seven, and wherever this number occurs we must expect to find something intimately related to the peculiar characteristics of these three disciples; as, for example, the twenty-four elders of Revelation in connection with the four living creatures, the opening of the last three seals, the sounding of the last three trumpets, and pouring out of the last three vials. In the counterfeit, or Satan's kingdom, we may also expect to trace a distorted analogy, where false prophets become the representatives of the "*world*, the *flesh*, and the *devil*." (These words I quote from man's Bible, consequently we are not surprised to find them transposed. God's word says, "Earthly, sensual, devilish."—James iii.

15.) "Judgment, mercy, and faith" are inscribed on the three departments of God's kingdom.

In the future we hope to be able to trace an analogy, drawn from the characteristics of these disciples, through the last three of the seven parables recorded in Matthew xiii., as well as a distorted counterfeit in the last three of the seven horns of the great beast of Revelation.

"*The damsel is not dead, but sleepeth.*" Christ uses these words in anticipation of the resurrection. Her body was dead, but her soul was not dead, as they had supposed. She died under the old dispensation; and all who die under the two forms of that dispensation *sleep* unto the judgment day. Had she been a reprobate, she would have been dead sure enough, being condemned already in this life. When the woman cured of the bloody issue, and now made a daughter of Christ, dies, her body dies, but her soul passes at once into the *parousia*, or presence of Christ. She does not sleep. Christ speaks not of the condition of the body, but of the condition of the soul. If the world misunderstood Him, that was no fault of His.

"*He taketh the father and mother of the damsel, and them that were with Him.*" The father and mother were types of the future church. The mother the membership, and the father the ministry, of which the three disciples were the representatives.

"*Talitha cumi; which is, being interpreted, Damsel, (I say unto thee,) arise.*" "Talitha" was a word of endearment, something similar to "my child."

We notice here the difference between the word with which Christ addresses this child, or *servant*, of the old dispensation, whose salvation depends upon a faith passing through carnal mediators, and the word daughter, with which He addresses the woman whose sins are forgiven on her own personal faith in Christ Himself, she having lost all faith in these carnal mediators.

"*And He charged them straitly that no man should know it; and commanded that something should be given her to eat.*" See the bold contrast in the command given here to that given to the sanctified believer of Gadara, from whom the demons had been expelled. He was commanded to return to his countrymen, and show them what great things God had done for him; but this girl was to remain at home, and not publish abroad the history of her healing. But why are the two commands, to keep the matter a secret and give her something to eat, combined by the evangelist in one sentence? Here we have the key which unlocks the mystery. She requires further nourishment before she can be of service to her mother. She requires to grow in knowledge and grace for a long time before she can go out into the world and tell others how she has been brought to Christ and sanctified by Him. The newly sanctified souls on the day of Pentecost were in a similar condition; hence it is recorded of them that "they continued steadfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship." (Acts ii. 42, *Revised Version.*) I think perhaps there was also another object in view, and

that was, to guard and shield her as much as possible from the scoffs and sneers of a wicked world. The man of Gadara, and the woman healed of the bloody issue, had strength to resist all these, but she could not, for she was as yet but a child. But Matthew tells us that "The fame hereof went abroad into all that land." What the parents would not publish the world did. Let a sinner be converted, and the world is ready to publish the news, with many additions and comments, to suit the enemy, who feels that he has lost a member from his kingdom.

THE HEALING OF THE PARALYTIC.

"And again He entered into Capernaum after some days; and it was noised that He was in the house. And straightway many were gathered together, insomuch that there was no room to receive them, no, not so much as about the door: and He preached the word unto them. And they come unto Him, bringing one sick of the palsy, which was borne of four. And when they could not come nigh unto Him for the press, they uncovered the roof where He was: and when they had broken it up, they let down the bed wherein the sick of the palsy lay. When Jesus saw their faith, He said unto the sick of the palsy, Son, thy sins be forgiven thee. But there were certain of the scribes sitting there, and reasoning in their hearts, Why doth this man thus speak blasphemies? who can forgive sins but God only? And immediately, when Jesus perceived in His spirit that they so reasoned within themselves, He said unto them, Why reason ye these things in your hearts? Whether is it easier to say to the sick of the palsy, Thy sins be forgiven thee; or to say, Arise, and take up thy bed, and walk? But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins, (He saith to the sick of the palsy,) I say unto thee. Arise, and take up thy bed, and go thy way into thine house,

And immediately he arose, took up the bed, and went forth before them all; insomuch that they were all amazed, and glorified God, saying, We never saw it on this fashion."—Mark ii. 1–12.

In a house in Capernaum sits Jesus, the Divine Teacher. A multitude has gathered in that house, ostensibly to listen to Him, but rather to give their own doctrines and opinions a hearing. They have filled up the room, and crowded around the door, until no one can find entrance. At this juncture, four men come, bearing one sick of the palsy; but, being unable to gain entrance, they ascend to the roof, and break up the roof, and let him down into the room where the Great Physician is seated.

Many religious teachers, ignorant of Eastern customs, have tried to explain this letting down through the roof, so that it would appear reasonable to the minds of people who are only accustomed to shingle roofs, with sharp combs, like the roofs of our common houses in the United States. Some suppose that they first went up upon a hill back of the house, and from that passed over on to the roof. Others, objecting to the breaking up of the roof, have imagined that they let him down into the court, or through some stairway passing up through the roof.

Now, I am familiar with the construction of these Eastern houses, and can almost imagine that I see these four men with the paralytic, going through the whole process described here by the evangelist. The house is built of a series of rooms, one story high, surrounding a court. From this court there extends a stone stairway to the roof, which is made, not of

old, half-round Dutch tiles, but of large, square bricks, made for the purpose, each one being about twelve or fourteen inches square, and about an inch and a quarter thick. Upon this roof the family, perhaps accompanied by one or two friends, sit in the morning and cool of the evening, and engage in their morning and evening devotions. To prevent accidents, there is a wall or breastwork around the outer edge of the roof, to keep people from falling off; and inside this wall, on the lower side, the roof being slightly inclined, there is a gutter, which collects all the rain-water falling upon it and carries it to the great cistern in the centre of the court.

On finding the way obstructed, the bearers of the sick man pass around to the back entrance, enter the court through a hall or passageway from the garden, only again to find the way obstructed, for Jesus is not in the court, but in one of the rooms. Seeing the stairway vacant, they ascend to the roof with their burden, and find themselves directly over the great Master's head. They hear His voice beneath, but cannot find a way to His presence. Nothing daunted, they are determined to force an entrance. A chisel is at once applied to one of the square bricks, which is soon loosened from its bed of cement and carefully laid to one side. Another, and then another, are removed in the same way, until a large space is opened up. But beneath this there is a second layer of bricks. This also must be removed. This may be done carefully, so as to produce little or no inconvenience to the audience beneath, as the cement between the bricks is very

thin, and would mostly adhere to the bricks until beaten off with a trowel. Beneath this second layer of bricks they find a layer of laths, or strips of wood, about three feet long, and rived out or split from the tree, all the work being of the most primitive order; consequently these strips would be quite different from such work done at a steam saw-mill in our country at the present day. As nails were scarce, being entirely hammered out by hand, and used only where it was absolutely necessary, these strips were tied fast to the joists beneath with thongs or strips of green ox-hide, which shrink in drying, and hold these laths down as fast and solid as any nails would. These thongs are easily cut with a sharp knife, and the laths removed. A few small pieces of dry cement fall upon the audience beneath, and arouse their attention—perhaps amuse them—but do not frighten them in the least. The whole could be done in less than fifteen minutes, and almost as quickly laid down again, by calling in the assistance of a mason, with a trowel and a small quantity of fresh cement.

"*When Jesus saw their faith.*" Christ does not notice the faith of the sick man, but the faith of the four persons who had brought him into His presence. It was the faith which impelled these persons to take such extraordinary means to bring the sick man before Him, so confident were they that He would heal him.

"*Son, thy sins be forgiven thee.*" The word *son* here is improper. This is a human translation. The Greek word τεκνον means a child or servant, and not

a son. This man was a representative of a sinner under the old dispensation. True, Christ, in the very same sentence, pronounces the pardon of his sins; but we must not confound this case with the woman healed of the bloody issue, to whom He says, "Daughter, *thy faith* hath made thee whole." The record gives us no evidence that this man possessed any faith of his own. The faith of those who brought him there is spoken of, but nothing is said about his faith. Palsy and leprosy were, by the Jews, so identified with sin that they could not be separated from it in the Jewish mind; consequently, to be cured of either was to have one's sins forgiven.

Leprosy was a type, or rather symbol, of sin, in its corroding, corrupting influence, eating away the flesh—ulcerating, destroying, and decaying. Palsy, again, was another symbol of sin, in its deadening, benumbing tendency, leaving the poor sufferer often unconscious of his sad estate—for palsy, in a majority of cases, affects the mind as well as the body—and always in a condition in which he cannot help himself. These two conditions we have seen fully expressed in the miracle of the man of Gadara. He was like one suffering with leprosy, fully conscious of his sad estate; every nerve on fire; his sins, like a legion of demons, tormenting him day and night, until they become so incorporated with his own being that he feels that they are part of himself, two natures dwelling in one body, the carnal and the demon nature, and so incorporated that he involuntarily exclaims "we," "I," "us," using the singular or plural as these natures gain the ascend-

ancy. He dwells in a charnel-house, and can get no rest, and he cries out, in all the agony of a lost soul, "I delight in the law of God after the inward man; but I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" (Rom. vii. 22–25.) On the other hand, his countrymen, like the man suffering with palsy, are perfectly unconscious that their occupation is a monstrous crime of rebellion against the God of the land, and they profit and grow fat on their unlawful merchandise, looking upon their sins as the men of Gadara looked upon their flocks of swine, as only so many innocents, feeding upon the distant mountain-side. Such persons must be awakened and aroused to a sense of their lost condition, before they can be made sons of God and of Christ. To this sad condition the man from whom the demons had been expelled, and the woman healed of the bloody issue, had been awakened long before they came to Jesus. Consequently Jesus addresses this man as He would a servant, by the very appropriate term, "child."

"*But there were certain of the scribes sitting there, and reasoning in their hearts, Why doth this man thus speak blasphemies? Who can forgive sins but God only?*" Had He not been God, He would most certainly have been guilty of blasphemy; but He immediately proved to them that He was more than man, by revealing to them a positive proof, which they could not deny, in the fact that He possessed

a knowledge of what was passing in their own breasts.

"*But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins, (He saith to the sick of the palsy,) I say unto thee, Arise, take up thy bed, and go thy way into thine house. And immediately he arose, took up the bed, and went forth before them all.*" Here He proves His divinity. If Christ had not been God, He would have not only been guilty of blasphemy in pretending to forgive this man's sins, but also of gross deception. He who could forgive sins must be divine. God alone, against whom sin is committed, can forgive sin. But that this man's sins were forgiven was not made perceptible to human eyes. On the contrary, the cure of palsy was perceptible. Here was a testimony they could not gainsay. This was visible, tangible evidence, which they could not deny.

None but God can give health and strength to a paralyzed body, and that He did so was an undoubted evidence of His divinity. Before this proof was given, they might have said that He was a very cunning impostor, pretending to forgive sins; something in the spiritual world which they did not believe He had or could perform, and yet which no one could prove to be false; for who could prove that this man's sins were not forgiven? But here is a manifest, visible proof, which no man could deny.

"*Whether is it easier to say*"—here presents a difficulty. *To say* one thing is just as easy as *to say* another. I understand the word "to say," here, to mean, *to claim authority*, or *claim the power*. Which

is easiest, to claim the power to forgive sins, or to claim the power to heal a paralytic? They would answer, It is easier to claim the power to forgive sins. To illustrate: I may claim the ability to speak the Spanish language, if I knew that no one in my company understood that language; but if there were twenty men in my presence who understood Spanish, I could not make that claim, without fear of being detected, unless I really possessed the ability.

"*Son of man hath power on earth.*" Not in heaven alone, but upon earth. I understand by the term here, "Son of man," *that Jehovah* who appeared as man to the patriarchs, and who now appeared clothed in human flesh, the Son of Mary. The Son of man, who came down from heaven, brought this power with Him. Are we to understand that it was the Son of man who appeared in the theophanies of the Old Testament, and was only revealed to His disciples visibly as the Son of God in the transfiguration and ascension?

"*And he immediately arose.*" The pretensions of Jesus are now fully confirmed. "*And they were all amazed and glorified God.*" We are not told what effect this miracle had upon the Pharisees and doctors of the law. They probably hardened their hearts like Pharaoh, for they afterwards crucified Him. But the multitude was amazed, and glorified God. There is a passage in Matthew's record of this miracle (Matt. ix. 8,) which caused me some difficulty at one period of my life. In studying the Romish controversy, I found that the Romanists

claim the words of Matthew—"They marvelled and glorified God, who had given such power *unto men*" —as a proof that their priests have the power to forgive sins. No one can claim that this refers alone to Christ, as the word is plural, "*men*," and not "*man*." Nor is the explanation, that this is the language of an ignorant multitude, satisfactory. It is the language of the inspired evangelist, and no criticism can change it. But the difficulty at once vanishes, if we turn to Christ's last prayer, and read, "I have given unto them the words which Thou gavest Me, and they have received them." The word is the power that *brings* sinners to Christ, and He forgives them. "Ye are clean through the word which I have spoken to you." It is the word which washes away sin, and that word was in the beginning with God. The utter ignorance of the word of God by the Romish priesthood, renders them the last men in the world capable of forgiving sins. The power or authority delegated to the ministry of the Church of Christ, is a thorough knowledge of God's word, and this the Romish priests most certainly have not.

Now, in order to understand the lesson to be learned by this miracle, we must first learn the primary object in view in its performance. This I believe to have been, to a certain extent, an effort on the part of Christ to prove His divinity to His disciples. They well understood that palsy was a symbol of the moral death produced by sin, and that whoever could heal this must be divine.

Let us, then, first examine the case of the patient.

Palsy is a disease in which the sufferer becomes unconscious of feeling. One limb only, or a portion of the body, may be affected, while the rest remains perfectly sound. Or it may extend to the whole body, including the brain as well, in which state the mind is probably more or less unconscious. Where the limbs only are affected, the man is perfectly conscious, but unable to move or help himself. He cannot feed himself, and if left alone must starve and perish. He has no sense of pain; prick him with a pin, or burn him with a hot iron, and he knows nothing about it. This is the condition of the great mass of sinners in this world. They have no consciousness of the deadening power of sin. And yet I am told by those who have suffered with palsy, that although there may be no outward sense of feeling, yet within, in what would appear to be the very marrow of the bones, there is often a most excruciating pain. This corresponds with the case of the men who were engaged in an illegitimate business in Gadara when they saw Christ. They were filled with fear and trembling at the fearful prospect of future retribution, and besought Christ to depart from them. The sinner may be perfectly unconscious of the weight of sin, but he fears lest Christ may open his eyes, and reveal to him its terrible guilt and corruption. This man could never come to Christ himself, but must be brought by others. He is unable to move hand or foot, much less to start off in his own strength in search of the great Physician; but God has provided the means in the gospel ministry.

Four men find this paralytic. There are four evangelists, and we call them Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. They are also the king, priest, prophet, and quickening spirit of the old dispensation. We call them by other names to-day, such as ministers, pastors, preachers, etc. They occupy the pulpit, and fill a prominent place in the Sabbath-school. These cannot cure the sick man, and make no pretensions to such a claim. If they did, they would be imposters. All they can do is to bring the sick man to where the cure is. But when they arrive at the place where the Divine word is to be found, there they encounter a great multitude, who have stopped up every entrance. Satan is there with all sorts of tramps. Pharisees and doctors of the law abound and fill up every door and window, until the Divine word is perfectly obscured, and they cannot gain entrance. Every window, nook, cranny and closet is full. There is absolutely no entrance. Roman Catholics, Infidels, Millerites, Mormons, Universalists, Quakers, Swedenborgians, Dunkards, Shakers, Seventh Day Baptists, Campbellites—a list of names a yard long would be required to designate the multitude who have filled the hall, the door, and the street in front, every one pretending that he is right, and all others of that vast multitude are wrong; and thus contending with each other, they have raised such a babble of confusion that the four evangelists with their burden can gain no admittance, and pass by unheeded, unless it may be that some over zealous doctor stops them and strives to convince the paralytic that in order to get well he must

join his church. But there is no obstruction great enough to deter the evangelists, or keep them from bearing their patient into the presence of the Sacred Word. The power to heal is there, and they mean to have it, and have it they will, even if they have to dig through a wall, or down through a brick roof. And so, wending their way around through the kitchen door into the court, and up the stairs to the roof, they find the Word completely covered up by glosses, commentaries and explanations of all kinds; but nothing daunted, with bar or spade, they dig down, throw the large bricks of error to one side, pry up the lath, and let down the patient into the very presence of the pure, unadulterated, living Word itself. And now, covered with perspiration, tired and weary, they seat themselves on the parapet, to rest and await the result; and as they gaze upon the tumultuous throng in the street, lo and behold, they see the crowd open, and the paralytic walk out with his bed strapped upon his back.

Here now we have evidence of the responsibility of the Christian ministry. The sinner, in the condition of this paralytic, has no faith adequate to the exertion necessary to carry him into the presence of Jesus. It was the faith of the evangelists which carried him there. This is confirmed by James, when he says, "Is any sick among you? call for the elders of the church, and let them pray over him. And the prayer of faith shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, they shall be forgiven him."

It must not, however, on the other hand, be in-

ferred that this man was healed without any desire on his own part. His compliance with the desires of the evangelists show that he had a desire to be healed; but it was not such a desire as that which possessed the demoniac, who rushed into Christ's presence while He was officiating in the synagogue at Capernaum, a place from which he had been excluded, his presence polluting it. (Mark i. 24.) This man's faith was imperfect, and was shared by four human mediators.

A LEPER CURED.

"And there came a leper to Him, beseeching Him, and kneeling down to Him, and saying unto Him, If Thou wilt, Thou canst make me clean. And Jesus, moved with compassion, put forth His hand, and touched him, and saith unto him, I will; be thou clean. And as soon as He had spoken, immediately the leprosy departed from him, and he was cleansed. And He straitly charged him, and forthwith sent him away; and saith unto him, See thou say nothing to any man: but go thy way, shew thyself to the priest, and offer for thy cleansing those things which Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them. But he went out, and began to publish it much, and to blaze abroad the matter, insomuch that Jesus could no more openly enter into the city, but was without in desert places; and they came to Him from every quarter."—Mark i. 40–45.

The healing of the leper follows next in order after the curing of the man sick with palsy, showing the intimate relationship which the two miracles bear to each other, and to which I have already referred; palsy being a symbol of the dead-

ening, benumbing effects of sin, while leprosy, on the other hand, is a symbol of its corrupting, corroding, polluting, horrifying influence upon its subjects.

Leprosy was a corroding cancer, usually commencing with a small pimple or blister, and gradually spreading over the whole body until the entire system was affected by it; or in exceptional cases spreading immediately over the entire body, as in the example of Miriam, the sister of Moses, and in that of Gehazi, the servant of Elisha. Leprosy was supposed by the Jews to be the result of some grievous sin, such as was committed by Miriam and Gehazi. The Jewish rabbis say that when leprosy appeared in a house, that it was a warning to the person who dwelt therein that he was in eminent danger, and that he must repent and change his course of life at once. If he persisted in his course of wickedness, it next appeared in his clothing, and finally in his body.

This terrible malady was looked upon as a living death, corrupting, corroding, and polluting all the fountains of life, rendering existence a terrible burden; a living fire in the blood, tormenting, wasting, destroying, until the poor sufferer, reduced to a mere remnant of humanity, drops into the grave, and according to Jewish custom must be buried alone in the desert. Its corroding effect, the flesh dropping away in pieces from the bones, the joints decaying until the fingers and hands drop off, and the arms and legs fall from the body, are fearfully described by Aaron, when he pleads with the Lord for his sis-

ter Miriam, "Let her not be as one dead, of whom the flesh is half consumed."

Again, leprosy was considered a direct infliction of God, and could be cured by God alone. Physicians never pretended to have any power over this disease, consequently the Jews were compelled to acknowledge all permanent cures of leprosy as genuine miracles, coming from God Himself. They might say that Christ cast out devils by the prince of devils, but they could not say that He cured leprosy by the power of the devil.

The Mosaic law was very strict in regard to the disease of leprosy. The leper must rend his garments, cover his lip, and go with the head bare, crying, "Unclean, unclean," so that no one might come near him. (Lev. xiii. 45, 46.) Everything connected with leprosy was placed by the Mosaic law on a level with the person who had come in contact with a dead body. He was excluded from society. The covered lip, the bare head, the torn garment, the cedar wood, the hyssop and the scarlet used in the ceremony of his purification after he had been healed, and before he would be permitted to enter the synagogue or mingle in society, were all symbols of death. The leper cast out of the camp while they journeyed in the desert, and out of the city while they resided in Canaan, indicated that he was dead to his family and people, and dead to all society, unless, perchance, he should find another unfortunate like himself, with whom he could share his solitude and his misery. Often several lepers banded together, living in the same hut, and partaking of

food, left at some convenient place for them by relatives and friends, and which they divided with each other.

Nor was this all. The leper was looked upon as cut off from God. He could take no exterior part in the religion of his nation. He was considered as entirely separated from Israel—dead to the synagogue and temple service, and in a symbolical sense, cut off from God Himself, for "God is not the God of the dead, but the God of the living." It was in reference to such a state as this that the psalmist exclaims, "Purge me with hyssop and I shall be clean;" and it was to such a state as this, when all hope was gone, and the time of probation had expired, and prayer had lost its efficacy, that the seer of apocalyptic vision refers, when he says, "For without are dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolaters, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie." But of the New Jerusalem, whose inhabitants have been cleansed from the leprosy of sin, he says: "And there shall in no wise enter into it any thing that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie; but they which are written in the Lamb's book of life." Oh! what a most appropriate emblem this burning, corroding, corrupting disease is of the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death.

And here we have a wonderful mystery. The continual testimony of Christ during His mission was, that the lepers were cleansed,—as much as to say that the dead are restored to life. In fact, these miracles were on a par with those where dead bodies

were raised again to life from the dead; and yet the Jews could not receive this testimony as sufficient, but they must prove Him by putting Him to death. They supposed that if He were Divine that He could not be put to death. Such a thing, to their minds, was utterly impossible, unless He were what they supposed Him to be—an imposter. What! Put a Son of God to death. No! Never!! He claims to be the Son of God. This will prove whether He is or not. Try Him. Crucify Him. They never dreamed that He could lay down His life and take it again, although He had told them publicly that He would do so.

"*And there came a leper to Him, beseeching Him.*" This leper appears to have come suddenly to Christ and His disciples. He here violated the Levitical law in not giving warning of his approach; but as another evangelist says that he "worshipped Him," I think that there can be no doubt but this leper recognized the divinity of Christ, and consequently felt that he had violated no law of God in thus breaking through the ceremonial in order to approach the spiritual.

"*And Jesus, moved with compassion, put forth His hand and touched him.*" Had Jesus been a mere man—a Jew—He could not have touched him without Himself being defiled. The priests, who were types of Christ, were not only permitted, but commanded to come in contact with the leper, and pronounce him clean or unclean, according to the state of the case; but even these must pass through a ceremonial purification before they would feel at

liberty to officiate in the temple service. But Christ could put His holy hands upon the unclean and receive no defilement. To the pure all things are pure. No leprosy could contaminate a pure Savior. The Great Physician here shows His kingly authority over the disease. The demons are subject to Him, and so are all diseases. He has power to cure them all, and can be infected by none, no, not even that most universal disease, sin.

"*Go thy way, show thyself to the priest.*" Christ here commands him to comply with the requirements of the Levitical law. He is still living under the Mosaic dispensation, and consequently is bound to fulfil the law. He must go to the Levitical priest, and show himself to him, be pronounced clean, go through the usual ceremony of purification, according to the cure of leprosy, and then offer the gifts and sacrifices required by the Levitical law.

Christ strictly charged this man that he should tell no one; but go straight to the priest. Many reasons have been given why this charge was made, some supposing that it was to avoid the jealousy of the priests, who, if they knew that he had been cured by Christ, might, in their malice and blind rage, pronounce him to be still unclean. If this had been the true reason, this man would most probably have understood it, and not have published it abroad, as he did, unless he had been very foolish indeed. In fact, none but a fool would have acted so, under such circumstances. I think that the true reason, although somewhat obscure, is given to us in the relation. He published it abroad, "insomuch

that Jesus could no more openly enter into the city, but was without in desert places." What Jesus wished to avoid was that gaping crowd of curiosity seekers, who were drawn together merely to gratify a morbid desire to see something new and wonderful; who would run up one street in great haste to see the Messiah heal a leper, and down the next street in just as much haste to see a dog-fight. To-day, they would cry out at the top of their voice, "Hosannah to the Son of David!" and to-morrow, "Crucify Him! crucify Him!" Our Lord wishes to avoid this crowd, and consequently charges this man to say nothing about the cure; but, under the circumstances, it was a very difficult matter for him to keep silent. A soul redeemed from death cannot remain silent. He must tell what God has done for him. I have often thought that if I had lived in those times in Spain when the Spanish inquisition ruled, and men and women were tied by scores in large furnaces and burned to death, that I should have been very careful to say nothing about my religion; but when men have been saved from the leprosy of sin, they care but little what men can do to the body, and they are compelled to publish to the world what the Lord has done for them.

The difficulty, then, was not so much in the cured leper publishing the news of his cure, but in the obstructions which the worldly crowd, full of noise and curiosity, would throw in the way, and thus hinder His work as a teacher, when He required a quiet audience, who came to be instructed, and not

amused; consequently he is now compelled to remain without in desert places.

The result, in the end, however, was favorable. The noisy crowd, however much impelled by curiosity, would not go outside of the city walls to hear a Divine Teacher. Curiosity alone would never take them out into the desert. Those who sought Jesus through a higher and more sublime motive than mere curiosity, will go to Him in the desert. Yes, and if need be, will follow Him to the dungeon and to the stake, in order to find Him. They care not what price they pay for the pearl of great price.

Christ cured this leper by *laying His hands* upon him. Yes, He who knew no sin laid hold on our fallen nature, all defiled and corroded with sin as it was by the fall, and He healed it. "As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive."

Reader, do you feel to-day that you are suffering with the terrible leprosy of sin, and that soon you must share a leper's grave in the desert outside of the New Jerusalem, unless you are healed of this terrible malady? If so, then let me present to your notice the Great Physician, who is mighty to save. Come to Him, not out of mere curiosity to see a wonder-working prophet, but come that you may be saved from your sins. Let Him put His hands upon you, filling your veins with His own life-giving blood. Let Him breathe upon that dead soul, and you will feel your whole being thrill with ecstatic joy and life eternal.

THE CENTURION'S SERVANT.

"Now when He had ended all His sayings in the audience of the people, He entered into Capernaum. And a certain centurion's servant, who was dear unto him, was sick, and ready to die. And when he heard of Jesus, he sent unto Him the elders of the Jews, beseeching Him that He would come and heal his servant. And when they came to Jesus, they besought Him instantly, saying, That he was worthy for whom He should do this: for he loveth our nation, and he hath built us a synagogue. Then Jesus went with them. And when He was now not far from the house, the centurion sent friends to Him, saying unto Him, Lord, trouble not Thyself; for I am not worthy that Thou shouldest enter under my roof: wherefore neither thought I myself worthy to come unto Thee: but say in a word, and my servant shall be healed. For I also am a man set under authority, having under me soldiers, and I say unto one, Go, and he goeth; and to another, Come, and he cometh; and to my servant, Do this, and he doeth it. When Jesus heard these things, He marvelled at him, and turned Him about, and said unto the people that followed Him, I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel. And they that were sent, returning to the house, found the servant whole that had been sick." —LUKE vii. 1–10.

"Verily, I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel. And I say unto you, That many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven: but the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."—MATT. viii. 10–12.

THE account of this miracle given by Matthew is somewhat different from that given by Luke. The account given by Luke has usually been supposed by commentators to be the correct one, while Matthew speaks of the centurion as doing in person what in reality was done by proxy. Luke, however, speaks of him as first sending the elders, and then

his friends, and I see no difficulty in supposing that he might have thought best to have gone in person after having sent there, thus giving both evangelists a literal translation: Matthew recording one part of the transaction, while Luke records another part.

This centurion, as his title indicates (captain of a *centum*, or hundred soldiers), was an officer in the Roman army. I find nothing in the record to indicate whether the servant was a Jew or Gentile. If he were a Gentile, he would be permanently outside of the kingdom of Israel; and if he were a Jew, he would be temporarily in the same condition, that is, impure, while dwelling in a Gentile house. But Christ came to the "lost sheep of the house of Israel;" and this servant, if he were a Jew, would be of that especial class to which Christ was sent in person.

This centurion—like Cornelius, the first Gentile convert to Christianity, and spoken of in the Acts, occupying the same office in the Roman army, for they were both centurions—was probably one of the many Gentiles of that time who, having made themselves familiar with Moses and the prophets, were looking for Him to whom the Gentiles should come, as the One who should cure all the infirmities to which our human nature is subject, and which He will eventually do; not in this present kingdom of grace, but in the kingdom of glory, which is but an outgrowth of the former.

Trench, in his work on the miracles, claims this man as a proselyte, and some, at least, if not many commentators claim Cornelius as a proselyte also;

but I find nothing in the record to lead me to think that they were. In fact, I feel fully convinced that they were not. (1), I do not think that an officer in the Roman army would have been allowed to retain his position if he had forsaken by public ceremony the religion of the Roman empire. Even to-day no man who does not belong to the religion of the State can hold even the lowest office under the State in Peru and the Argentine Republic, and it is but a short time since a law was passed in Brazil allowing persons to hold office in the government who did not support the Roman Catholic Church. (2), All the circumstances indicate that these persons were full-blooded Gentiles, and not proselytes. (3), Had this centurion been a proselyte, it would have stood upon the record, instead of that which is recorded, "he hath built us a synagogue," as this would have been of more importance to them. (4), Cornelius, at least, used Gentile food, otherwise Peter would not have hesitated in going with his messengers at once, without the necessity of a vision from heaven, and it is probable that this centurion did the same, as he would be compelled to participate in the festivals of his countrymen.

We notice, however, Gentile as he was, many favorable traits in this man's character—his earnest love and compassion for a servant. This, it appears to me, was an extraordinary trait in the character of a Roman military officer of that period. This shows his kind sympathizing disposition. Then, his love for the Jewish nation, having built them a synagogue, in which he could not take a part, and in which, if

permitted to enter at all, he would be compelled to take a back seat, and take no part in the exercises; his profound knowledge of the Messiah and of His mission, all indicate that he was a most extraordinary character.

"*I am not worthy that Thou shouldest enter under my roof.*" I cannot understand this language in any other light than that this man understood thoroughly the whole mission and character of our Lord, and this appears to be confirmed by our Savior's exclamation, that He had not found such faith in Israel. The analogy by which he compares his own position with that of the Savior is remarkable. He says, "I am a man under authority;" that is, he must be obedient to his superior officers, and whatever they commanded him to do, he must obey. He also is an officer over others. He commands this servant to do this, and he doeth it. He commandeth that one to do that, and his command is immediately obeyed. Here we have the true character of the sixth great enemy of Israel—military rule, slavery to superior human officers, and not obedience to God. This man considered that, as Christ was Ruler over the spiritual world, that He had command over all diseases; He has but to command, and He will be obeyed. Nor was he wrong in this. He who created man at the beginning, and created his body in such a condition that it might be subject to disease, must certainly have power to make any change in His own workmanship that He chooses, or to repair any part that has become injured or is not of order.

Some expositors have supposed that this centurion

looked upon Christ as King of the angels, and that He had but to command an angel and he would do the work for Him; while others supposed that he considered the different diseases as subject to so many demons, and as Christ had control over evil spirits, that He could command those demons to remove the disease, and it would be done; but I find nothing in the record to indicate that an angel or a demon could do it for Him. I think that he looked upon Christ as King over all diseases, which He really must have been, if He were the true Messiah of which all the prophets bore witness.

Matthew says: "When Jesus heard it He marvelled, and said to them that followed, Verily, I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel." With some it appears to be a difficulty, why Jesus, knowing the hearts of all men, should marvel. But I see no difficulty here. In this His humanity is manifested; just as it was in those cases where we are told that He had compassion, that He hungered, that He wept, etc.

And to all human understanding this is a wonder, that the very people to whom the law was given, and to whom all the prophets had been sent, a people who for ages had been taught the nature and coming of the Messiah, and of His kingdom, should not know Him when He came; but should coldly turn away from Him and crucify Him; while this and other Gentiles outside of the kingdom of Israel should so thoroughly comprehend His mission as at once to accept His doctrine, and enter into His Spirit and

kingdom. "And I say unto you," continues our Lord, "that many shall come from the east and from the west, and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven; but the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."

Oh! what a terrible warning this is to those who have received all the advantages of an early education! pious parents who have endeavored to guide their feet in infancy in the way they should go; Christian privileges, in a land of Bibles and Bible influence; the blessings of the Church and Sabbath school; the companionship of pious friends and relatives; for whom many a prayer has been offered, and many a sympathizing tear shed; with whom a kind father or an affectionate mother has often pleaded; upon whose ears many a gospel sermon has fallen as the rain upon the hard rock, making no impression, and leaving no trace upon the page of memory; who have been induced by persuation, or the promise of rewards, to commit many passages of Scripture to memory, but upon the tablet of whose cold, hard hearts those passages remain as meaningless as the fingerboard at a cross-road, whose inscription has been effaced, pointing, silently pointing, somewhere, but where the stranger knows not, until they rot and fall into the dust, useless to the world, to society, to the Church, to the Sabbath-school, and alike useless to themselves; pointing, pointing meaninglessly into space, indicating that

the great Physician has passed them and cured them not, for they knew not His power to heal; indicating that Christ had been preached to them in the gospel, but they know not the gospel's cleansing power; and so they, the children of the kingdom, are cast out into outer darkness, while some poor wanderer, who has been born and educated in pagan lands, trained under some form of cold, lifeless pantheism, who in his early years was taught by wicked parents to blaspheme the sacred name of Jesus; to look upon the book of Divine revelation as an assortment of old wives' fables; trained to look upon a God jealous of His holy law as a myth, and heaven and hell as the phantasm of a disordered brain; suddenly hears of Jesus Christ the Savior, and hearing believes, and believing is saved, and becomes an heir of the kingdom, and is seated with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the Paradise of God, saved from death and sin.

There has been considerable discussion as to what the disease was with which this centurion's servant suffered. Matthew says that it was palsy, and that he was grievously tormented; and Luke adds that he was at the point of death. Palsy with us is not considered a painful disease. It is said, however, that there is a palsy in the east that is very aggravated, and often produces death. Whether such is the case, or whether our translators should have given the name of some other disease, such as *lock-jaw*, is a matter of little consequence. The great fact remains, this servant was healed on account of

the faith and intercession of his master, and that master was outside of the visible kingdom.

This teaches us how careful those who have the care of children and servants should be to intercede with Christ in their behalf, even supposing that they themselves are not members of the visible Church.

MIRACLE AT THE POOL OF BETHESDA.

"After this there was a feast of the Jews; and Jesus went up to Jerusalem. Now there is at Jerusalem by the sheep market a pool, which is called in the Hebrew tongue Bethesda, having five porches. In these lay a great multitude of impotent folk, of blind, halt, withered, [waiting for the moving of the water. For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water: whosoever then first after the troubling of the water stepped in was made whole of whatsoever disease he had.] And a certain man was there, which had an infirmity thirty and eight years. When Jesus saw him lie, and knew that he had been now a long time in that case, He saith unto him, Wilt thou be made whole? The impotent man answered Him, Sir, I have no man, when the water is troubled, to put me into the pool: but while I am coming, another steppeth down before me. Jesus saith unto him, Rise, take up thy bed, and walk. And immediately the man was made whole, and took up his bed, and walked: and on the same day was the Sabbath.

The Jews therefore said unto him that was cured, It is the Sabbath day: it is not lawful for thee to carry thy bed. He answered them, He that made me whole, the same said unto me, Take up thy bed, and walk. Then asked they him, What man is that which said unto thee, Take up thy bed, and walk? And he that was healed wist not who it was: for Jesus had conveyed Himself away, a multitude being in that place. Afterward Jesus findeth him in the temple, and said unto him,

Behold, thou art made whole : sin no more, lest a worse thing come unto thee. The man departed, and told the Jews that it was Jesus which had made him whole. And therefore did the Jews persecute Jesus, and sought to slay Him, because He had done these things on the Sabbath day."—JOHN v. 1-16.

"*There was a feast of the Jews.*" It is a disputed question as to what feast is referred to here, and one also which has excited much curiosity among Bible students. If it could be known to a certainty, we should then be no longer in doubt as to the length of Christ's ministry. As it is at present, we must depend upon Daniel's prophecy, that it was half a week of years—that is, three years and six months, or twelve hundred and sixty days. It could hardly be at the Passover, as that occurred at an inclement season of the year, and does not correspond with the statement that a great multitude of sick people were lying under the porches at the pool of Bethesda.

The next question connected with this miracle is the place. We are told that the pool was called Bethesda—a word signifying *gate or house of mercy.* A pool has for ages been pointed out to travellers as the pool of Bethesda; but as it is some seventy or eighty feet deep, it is impossible that that could have been the place. An intermittent fountain, however, has been found, which appears to correspond with the description given here.

But a still greater mystery surrounds this miracle. All eminent critics pronounce the fourth verse of this chapter spurious. Alford, Tischendorf, and all others well versed in the Greek text, leave it out of the original, and I notice that the *Revised Version* does the same. It is found in none of the ancient

manuscripts; and in those modern manuscripts in which the passage is found, it is with various readings, and invariably marked with a star or asterisk, to denote that it is of doubtful origin. Again, there are seven words in this verse, part of which are to be found nowhere else in John's Gospel, and the others nowhere with the same sense which they contain here. In my own mind, an argument presents itself in favor of the genuine authority of this verse, which, to me at least, has great force, although it would be rejected by legitimate criticism. I think I find an analogy—an application of the type to the antitype—in which the services of an angel, or some similar person, would be required. Supposing the pool to represent the gospel; it is dead, cold, worthless, until stirred up—preached by God's ministers—and then, whoever embraces the opportunity immediately is saved; but if neglected, the stirring up soon becomes a dead letter, and loses its power. It is possible that occasionally passages similar to this may have been marginal readings, afterwards incorporated in the text by careless transcribers, or they may have been of genuine authority, derived from analogies in the prophecies of the Old Testament, and although not written by the person to whom the gospel or epistle is attributed, may nevertheless be of Divine authority.

Again, there is another question of importance, and that is, as to where this fountain received its healing qualities. A theory, which has been embraced by many, is that the sacrifices of the temple being washed, the blood thus washed away ran down

into this pool, and thus imparted to it its healing qualities, and that only on the occasion of great festivals, and that a messenger (not an angel from heaven) was sent down at a certain time, when the waters were supposed to be in a right condition, to stir them up, and then whoever stepped in was healed. But this does not correspond with the record, for it appears to me that such a natural cause as this, if it imparted a cure to one, would impart a cure to many at the same time.

It is possible, however, that the reception of this passage into the text has had its origin in an error of doctrine in regard to baptism. It was taught in the early church that the water used in baptism must be consecrated, or no good would result from it;—that there must, in some way, be a spiritual influence imparted to the water; and then the candidate must be immersed in it, and that he came out regenerated—that is, that a spiritual nature was imparted to him in baptism, which made him a new creature. Hence they speak of the *baptismal angel* consecrating the baptismal waters. This idea had become so extensive that it is quite possible that this passage had been introduced here in the margin, and afterwards incorporated in the text.

The idea that the waters received any healing properties from the washings of the sacrifices I believe to be a myth, as there is no proof whatever that the sacrifices were ever washed.

The facts of the case, as they present themselves to my own mind, are just these: the pool of Bethesda was an intermittent fountain. It was then as it is

now, only perhaps somewhat deeper, and with a more abundant supply of water. A modern traveller describes it, if I remember rightly, as completely dry a portion of the time. People come with buckets and pitchers, and find no water, and sit down and wait till the water comes. It comes rushing for an hour or so from the rock, and then ceases to run—just like the preaching of the gospel in our pulpits to-day.

I believe that there were no healing qualities in the waters, nor were they imparted to them, any more than there were to the waters of the Jordan to effectuate a cure of leprosy, although, in the history of the world, one man was cured, not by the waters, but by a divine power imparted to him in consequence of his obedience and faith. His cure was a miracle, and so were these.

These waters being typical, there was no healing quality imparted to the person who entered them except while they were in motion, and only so long as they remained pure. This pool corresponds with all cases in the Levitical law in which running water was used. It was only beneficial while the water was running. The moment the water stopped running, its value was gone. The waters could only cure while they were in motion. When the gospel is preached to sinners, it must be immediately embraced, or it loses its power. "To-day if ye will hear His voice, harden not your hearts." The moment they came in contact with a diseased person, he was healed; but in contact with him they became polluted, and could cure no others. We speak of

the waters as imparting a healing power, although I must again deny that there was virtually any healing power inherent in them. I think that Christ would say to every one who was ever healed in this pool, "Thy faith hath made thee whole." The healing power was as much in the man as it was in the water. It was divine—a miracle called down from above by man's faith. And yet the gospel must be "stirred up," preached by human instrumentality, before the sinner can be benefited by its saving grace; otherwise it remains but a dead letter.

This fountain of Bethesda is a type of the fountain of life to which the prophet Zechariah refers when he says, "In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, for sin and for uncleanness." (Zech. xiii. 1.) The analogy here is perfect. To many the word of God is but a dry, rocky channel, containing no cooling, refreshing stream. To some, it may contain for them, through the larger portion of life, nothing but a dry, arid rock, and then suddenly break forth into a cool, healing fountain of life, that will calm every fever and heal every wound, but when polluted by human infirmity, loses its power. It must be pure—the pure, living word, unmingled with human error and perfectly free from false doctrine; but contaminated with these, its power is gone for ever.

It has been observed that the spiritual kingdom of God is divided into three departments, the law, the gospel, and the Spirit, or that of justice, mercy, and faith. The name of this pool, Bethesda (House of Mercy), would indicate that it is a type of the

second department, that of the gospel. This, again, is subdivided into five porches, under which is a great multitude of infirm persons, suffering the weight of their sins, and longing to be made free from the bonds of the law by the preaching of the gospel of peace. It would be well to remember this mystic number *five* here, as we may have occasion to refer to it again.

"*And a certain man was there, which had an infirmity thirty and eight years.* It is usually supposed that this man had been lying in the porches of Bethesda thirty-eight years. Others, to avoid the supposed difficulty, make him thirty-eight years of age. The record says that *he had suffered thirty-eight years* with the malady. It does not tell how long he had been at the pool of Bethesda. It may have been a month, or it may have been several years; John does not tell us.

"*When Jesus saw him lie, and knew that he had been now a long time in that case, He saith unto him, Wilt thou be made whole? The impotent man answered Him, Sir, I have no man, when the water is troubled, to put me into the pool; but while I am coming, another steppeth down before me.*" Notice, here, that Jesus singles out one, and only one, of this multitude, and that one was a person who was unable to help himself. All others who had been healed heretofore were able to help themselves, or had some kind relative or friend who was able and willing to assist them; but this man was all alone in the world, with no sympathizing friend to take him by the hand and lead him down into the healing

fountain. Year after year he saw others going away healed, but he must suffer disappointment after disappointment. Israel had her priests, her scribes and Pharisees, her elders, and rulers of her synagogues; all shepherds—all professing to lead the unclean into the ways of purity and holiness, and no doubt many of them were good and faithful shepherds; but this man, like the woman healed of the bloody issue, had failed to profit by any of these physicians. But it was to just such as he was that Christ came, that is, to the *lost* sheep of the house of Israel. It was when he found himself alone in the world, with no eye to pity him and none to have compassion on him, that the blessed Savior comes and asks him if he would be made whole.

"*Jesus said unto him, Rise, take up thy bed, and walk. And immediately the man was made whole, and took up his bed, and walked.*" Notice that Christ here heals this man entirely outside of all ceremonial law. He received no baptism from the pool, but he was healed even before he knew that it was Jesus that healed him. Others may derive what inference they choose from this remarkable circumstance, but as for me, it is an abundant testimony that it is not necessary to bathe in the pool, or know Christ unto perfection, in order to taste His healing power to save. Christ commands him to take up his bed, and walk. Although he may pass from under the dominion of the law into the kingdom of grace, yet a remembrance of past sins, and not only their remembrance, but their pernicious influence, like a sad weight of sorrow, will still cling to him,

and mar his happiness in that Sabbath of grace reserved for the sanctified until the body returns to dust.

"*On the same day was the Sabbath.*" Here was a cause for war. This great Prophet had commanded this man to break the law of Moses. And he certainly did, from a Jewish standpoint of view, break it, for the law expressly commands that no burden be carried on the Sabbath day. (Ex. xxxi. 13-17; Neh. xiii. 15-19; Jer. xvii. 21-22.) In their pretended love for Moses they lose sight of the Son of God. The wonderful miracle in the eyes of these malignant Jews dwindles to a mole hill, and is lost sight of, behind the great mountain of crime of which they accuse our Lord. And their folly is presented to us on the sacred page as a warning to men through all time; and yet not a week passes that we do not have examples of Satan's disciples doing the same thing, and preparing a record of their own shame, to be posted on their own brazen foreheads through eternity, a spectacle to angels and to men.

I have said that Christ commanded this man to break the law of Moses; let us examine the subject a little farther and see if this is virtually true. Notwithstanding the proofs I have referred to, I do not think He did. I am inclined to think this was an exception, and does not come under that law. The law of Moses required that he should do no work *for himself* on that day; but there was no command that he should do no work, or carry no burdens, for the Lord on the Sabbath day. If by carrying his bed on the Sabbath day he could glorify God, by

manifesting the wonderful cure that had been performed upon him by Divine miracle, there was no law of Moses broken, and his accusers bring themselves under just condemnation.

"*Afterward Jesus findeth him in the temple.*" This presents a pleasing indication. He immediately went to the temple, probably to return thanks to God for his cure.

"*Sin no more, lest a worse thing come upon thee.*" The inference derived from these words of Jesus is, that some great sin had been the cause of this calamity. Thirty-eight long years of suffering he had endured for this sin. Perhaps he was quite young when this sin was committed, say, between twenty and thirty years of age; he would now be an old man, between sixty and seventy. But if he sins again, a worse calamity is to befall him. Worse than thirty-eight years of suffering must now extend into eternity. And will people tell us that punishment for sin is limited to this life? This man had now passed into the second department of the kingdom, and the law still had its hold upon him. He was in the temple observing the Mosaic law. If he had entered the third, or kingdom of the Spirit, into which the apostles entered on the day of Pentecost, I do not think that Jesus would have addressed him with such language. He is now justified; he would then have been sanctified, and such language as "sin no more lest a worse thing come upon thee," would have been inappropriate.

This man, who knew not his Divine Benefactor in the multitude, knew Him in the temple, and pro-

claims Him to the world. And oh! what a persecution has been raised against Jesus and His Church because He heals the sin-sick soul! For this very reason Judaism and paganism combined in the earlier ages to overthrow His kingdom.

Sinner, come to the healing fountain; God will move these waters for you, if you earnestly desire it, and send His life-giving power into your heart. Would you be made whole? forsake your sins and come to Christ. This is the true House of *Mercy*, and all are healed who can come here; but here their virtues are lost. They cannot pass to others polluted by human error.

And now we come to the practical teachings of the lesson. Much as I despise ritualism, I do not deprecate the appropriate instruments of grace, but would by no means attach an undue importance to them. We are not told how many may have been healed in this pool. Under old Judaism millions may have been saved, while as many others may have been lost.

Again, observe that the impotent man complains that he had no man to put him into the pool, and that while he was coming others stepped down before him. It made no difference how he got in, so that he really was in. Kind parents and teachers may have led him to the fountain, or he may have had his birth in pagan lands, and hearing the gospel preached for the first time, may have at once plunged into the living stream. And this reminds me of that expressive feature in the baptism of Paul. It is usually supposed that Ananias baptized Paul; but

examining the original text we find that Ananias said to Paul, "Arise and *baptize thyself*, and wash away thy sins, calling on His name." (Acts xxii. 16.) This man is healed without ever having been in the pool at all; and thousands will be found in Abraham's bosom who have never been circumcised in the flesh; and thousands will sit at the Lord's table in heaven who never sat at His visible table on earth. May Christ heal us all as He sees fit, and on the Sabbath day if He chooses; and if we inwardly worship Moses instead of Christ, may we renounce him, as well as all others whom we have transformed in our carnal blindness into idols, and learn to worship Christ alone, who alone is able to cleanse us from the power of sin.

THE FIVE THOUSAND FED.

"And when it was evening, His disciples came to Him, saying, This is a desert place, and the time is now past: send the multitude away, that they may go into the villages, and buy themselves victuals. But Jesus said unto them, They need not depart; give ye them to eat. And they say unto Him, We have here but five loaves and two fishes. He said, Bring them hither to Me. And He commanded the multitude to sit down on the grass, and took the five loaves, and the two fishes, and looking up to heaven, He blessed, and brake, and gave the loaves to His disciples, and the disciples to the multitude. And they did all eat, and were filled: and they took up of the fragments that remained twelve baskets full. And they that had eaten were about five thousand men, beside women and children."—MATT. xiv. 15–21.

UPON the death of John the Baptist, Christ retires to the desert. The reason usually given for this is,

that as Christ's time was not yet come to be crucified, He went to the desert in order to be more secure, and thus continue His mission unmolested until His hour was fully come. I hardly think that this was the true reason. I observe that John commences his account of this miracle by saying that "the Passover, a feast of the Jews, was nigh." This was not only to indicate at what season of the year this occurred, but also to show that great multitudes were passing through the desert from all parts of Israel to attend this great feast at Jerusalem; and as John's mission was not closed or finished by himself when he was beheaded, and his work being left incomplete, Christ went to the desert—John's mission field—to complete that work upon those very multitudes wending their way up to Jerusalem. The Passover was a type of that bread which came down from heaven to give life to the world. In the last miracle we had the gospel presented to us in the form of water washing away sin, but in this it is presented to us in the form of bread—spiritual food, of which the Passover was an appropriate emblem—hence we see how appropriate was this miracle, in which bread was the principal object on this occasion.

"*And they say unto Him, We have here but five loaves and two fishes.*" The evangelist John has recorded a conversation between Christ and His disciples which has been omitted by the other evangelists. Christ said "unto Philip, whence shall we buy bread that these may eat? And this He said to prove him, for He Himself knew what He would

do. Philip answered Him, Two hundred pennyworth of bread is not sufficient for them, that every one may take a little. One of His disciples, Andrew, Simon Peter's brother, said unto Him, There is a lad here, which hath five barley loaves and two small fishes; but what are they among so many?" (John vi. 5–9.) The other evangelists probably considered, as they usually did, that Peter was the spokesman for the whole of the disciples, and attributed to them what he said for them.

Philip said that two hundred pennyworth of bread would not be sufficient for such a multitude. From other parts of the Scripture we learn that a penny was the pay for a day's labor—say about one dollar of our money. Considering this sum, then, to be about two hundred dollars, it would not be far out of the way in purchasing a meal for five thousand people.

A notable point here should not be overlooked in this connection. The names of the two disciples who figure here in this conversation are Philip and Andrew, both Greek names, which indicates that some of their ancestry were of Greek origin, and consequently proselytes to the Jewish religion. When "certain Greeks" desired to see Jesus, they came to Philip and Andrew (John xii. 20–22), probably recognizing in them the characteristics of their own nation. Peter also was a brother of Andrew, and the three were natives of Bethsaida, a town within whose territory this miracle was probably performed. These three persons, representing the most carnal and legal part of the disciples, had

probably embraced this peculiar phase of the Jewish system from their intense love of the law, yet being unable to hold any office in the nation, from the fact that they could not trace their genealogy back to Abraham, were the more ready to accept such office under Christ. The name Philip signifies a *lover of horses*—a name which no true Hebrew would ever give to his child, the horse being to the Jew an unclean animal, and only tolerated as an instrument in warfare. We may then say that the name Philip virtually signifies *a warrior*. Andrew also signifies *manliness, strength, courage*—the attributes of a warrior, and to a great extent manifested in the horse—an animal which I understand to represent, in the typical language of prophecy, man's carnal nature. I also observe that the mystical number "five," which occupies a prominent part in this miracle, when used in the Old Testament, is usually in connection with valor, courage, bravery, etc., attributes of the horse as well as of the warrior.

"*And He commanded the multitude to sit down on the grass.*" Luke says, "And He said to His disciples, Make them sit down by fifties in a company." We see here the order displayed by the Divine Head of the Church which should ever characterize the officers of His Church on earth. If they had been allowed to come and help themselves, men, women, and children rushing headlong to secure a portion, confusion and disorder would soon have been the result. But He has them all seated in companies, and then gives the bread to His disciples, and the disciples, passing through each company in

regular order, give the bread to the multitude. Again, I think I perceive in this *sitting down* a submission of the carnal nature of man to the morality of the gospel, typified in the bread of which they were about to partake.

We notice, again, that it was barley, and not wheat bread, that was given to the multitude. Barley has ever been considered, in all ages, a very humble fare, and such as was much more appropriate for servants or laboring men than for the children and members of the father's family; consequently the bread here would rather represent the spiritual bread of the old dispensation than that of the new. This, again, appears to me to be a link binding Christ's desert-work with that of John the Baptist. Yet barley-bread was grateful to a hungry multitude on their way to Jerusalem. Had they been returning *from* Jerusalem, after having partaken of the sumptuous fare of the great capital, the case would have been materially different.

Mark says, "He commanded them to make all sit down by companies upon the green grass." Why is this *green grass* mentioned? I am very much inclined to accept the *verbal*, instead of the *plenary* theory of the inspiration of the Scriptures. Alford and others contend that the *plenary* inspiration of the Scriptures is necessary in order to reconcile the evangelists; but I do not consider this necessary if we take the view, which I hold, that each evangelist wrote that part, and *only* that part, which concerned the one peculiar characteristic of Christ which he as an evangelist felt himself bound to give to the world,

whether as King, Priest, Prophet, or Quickening Spirit.

The statement here that there was "much green grass in the place,' must have its meaning, or it is no part of God's word. On the same principle, I would observe, that in all our studies of the Bible we should ever observe all these little items, and strive to learn their meaning. They may appear to be of little consequence now, but the day may come when these little items will recall to our minds very important truths in intimate connection with analogies running all through the Bible.

The Greek words translated "green grass" are *χλωρον χόρτον*. The word *χλωρον* occurs in the description of the opening of the fourth seal in Revelation vi. 8, *ιππος χλωρος*, and is erroneously translated *a pale horse*. It should be a *green horse*, green being a symbol of regeneration. In the passage before us, it rather signifies that which produces regeneration, and refers here to the nature of that which gives spiritual life. The whole imagery of the occasion was intended to impress the minds of the audience with the Old Testament idea of a shepherd feeding his flock in the desert, and make them see vividly the connecting link between the type and the antitype. The shepherd Psalmist of Israel says: "The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want. He maketh me to lie down in green pastures; He leadeth me beside the still waters." (Ps. xxiii. 1, 2.) David, the ancient shepherd, fed his flock with green grass; but the Good Shepherd gives to His flock, on this occasion, *bread*—a far more appropriate symbol of that

spiritual food which came down from heaven to give life to the world.

"*There is a lad here which hath five barley loaves and two small fishes.*" John alone, the most spiritual of the evangelists, mentions these five barley loaves as being the property of *a lad*. Some manuscripts have "a *certain* lad." What other object could there be in giving us this information but to convey the mind back to the shepherd boy, (David, for instance,) who carries with him his daily supply of provisions while attending his flocks in the desert, and with which he is ready to part, selling or giving to the disciples for a sufficient recompense?

Again, observe the number of loaves and fishes. Ten is usually understood to represent *the whole* of any thing, and five one-half. If, then, we consider the kingdom of Israel to be divided into two equal parts, the number five would represent one of these parts. We notice a peculiar example of this in the parable of the ten virgins—five were foolish and five were wise. The same peculiarity may be observed wherever this number occurs in the Old Testament. When the king of Samaria wished to know what had become of the Syrian army, "One of his servants answered, and said, Let some take, I pray thee, five of the horses that yet remain, which are left in the city, (behold, they are as all the multitude of Israel which are left in it; behold, I say, they are even as all the multitude of the Israelites that are consumed:) and let us send and see." (2 Kings vii. 13.) The suggestion of sending *horses* in this passage shows a connection with the names of Philip and Andrew,

just referred to. Five, then, represents that half of the multitude to be profited by the eating of the bread, as well as that other half which would receive no benefit from it. The numbers *fifty* and *five* hundred have probably a similar significance. In the last miracle *water* was the symbol of the gospel, and in this bread. In that, there were *five* porches in which the sick were laid, awaiting the healing power which moved the waters; and in this, *five* loaves give refreshment to five thousand men, besides women and children. The number five here is significant, and well worthy of our study.

"*He took the five loaves and the two fishes, and looking up to heaven, He blessed, and brake, and gave the loaves to His disciples, and the disciples to the multitude.*" Let me call your attention to the peculiar language used here in regard to the blessing. What was it He blessed? Did He bless the bread, or did He bless the people, or did He bless His Father in heaven? I notice that in the establishment of the Eucharist, we are told that "He took the bread and gave thanks;" or, in other words, He blessed God. I am inclined to think that, unless there were especial reasons for doing so, Christ blessed our Father in heaven rather than the material element.

And now comes the miracle itself—a wonderful mystery, which is above and beyond our comprehension. The sacred narrator has merely given the facts in the case, and made no attempt whatever to reveal the secret. In the case of water turned into wine, we have one element transformed into another,

and yet all the properties possessed by the second, which did not belong to the first, must have been an act of creation. Here no new element and no new properties are created; but the quantity is increased, and that by no natural process. Wheat or corn sown into the ground is increased from year to year by a natural process; but no natural process can make it grow into bread. A thousand questions might be asked here, but who can answer them? We can analyze bread, and resolve it into its component elements; and we know that these elements are held more or less in solution in the atmosphere, in water, and in the soil from which the living plant receives its support and nourishment. Did Christ, in this miracle, suddenly condense these elements, as the electricity in the atmosphere is suddenly condensed, forming the thunderbolt? Or was it as much a part of Almighty creation as the creation of a world from nothing? We believe the creation of the earth to have been gradual. If we examine the rocks, we find them filled with sea-shells, indicating a long, tedious process through which they have passed in their formation, running through millions of ages. If we had a piece of those barley loaves given to the five thousand in our possession to-day, and could put it under a microscope, would we find it filled with particles of bran and fibre belonging to the barley grain, or was it a pure barley flour, free from all those imperfections belonging to the natural grain—a barley flour such as was never seen on earth on any other occasion? Or could we examine those fish, would we find it pure flesh, such as was never

eaten by mortal man, except in these instances in which the Great Miracle Worker produced it for His disciples and friends? or would we find it filled with bones and sinews, with here and there a broken fish-scale—particles of earthly matter which were unfit for food?

Or, supposing that we take a similar case. Bread we know is manufactured by man from a grain formed by a natural process of cultivation and growth, and then by the artificial means of crushing, grinding, bolting, etc., is transformed into flour, and then, by leavening and baking, into bread. Now, suppose that, instead of bread, we take a steamship. In the manufacture of this ship we will find corresponding degrees of development to those which we found in the process of making bread. The oak for the timber grows upon the mountain side, and the iron for its boilers and machinery has been formed by a natural process in the bowels of the earth. Man has collected these elements, and has brought them into proper shape, and put them together and polished them, until he looks upon the work of his hands as it plows its way in majestic grandeur through the briny waves, and he calls it perfect. But let us examine it. Beneath the paint which covers its exterior we behold the grains of the oak, showing how it came into existence, and we even detect imperfections in the oak itself—knots, worm holes, etc., filled up with putty, rotten places—in fact we may say that hardly a perfect spot is to be found in it. Now we examine the machinery, and we find the iron filled with earthy particles, and

covered with hammer marks; full of imperfections, resulting both from man's carelessness, and nature's defects in preparing the materials. Now, if Christ, instead of creating a loaf of bread, had instantaneously created a steamship, would it be like man's work, or would it be free from all defects, even from knot holes filled up with putty, and even free from porous holes, seen only with the microscope, and forming the grain of the wood?

I know that it is an easy matter to say that what Christ has made is perfect; but it is not quite so easy to prove it. The world which He has created is, in its present state, far from being perfect. It is filled with suffering and misery, giving us overwhelming proof of its deficiency; but I believe that He will create a world which will be perfect. The old covenant was not perfect. It waxed old and passed away; and the whole present dispensation, with all its imperfections, must pass away, in order to give place to one which is perfect.

Christ is the representative of a true gospel minister—the Good Shepherd who feeds His flock with the bread of life. The bread is the Bible—coarse barley bread to some, angel's food to others. The number of loaves (five) indicate perfection, but with the two fishes, or a doubling of the loaves, which gives us ten, is a symbol of perfection. And it is astonishing how often this number occurs in the life of the early shepherd of Israel. Jesse had three sons fighting in the camp, and he sends to them by the hand of David, the shepherd lad, "an ephah (*ten* omers) of corn, ten loaves," and "ten cheeses." The

supply of food, then, in ten parts, was sufficient, and consequently an emblem of perfection.

"*And they did all eat, and were filled; and they took up of the fragments that remained twelve baskets full.*" St. Augustine says: "That all the acts of Christ, who was God's Word manifested to us, are not pictures for us to look at and admire, but lessons for us to study and meditate upon." Christ, the Living Bread that came down from heaven for the life of the world, is an inexhaustible supply. Millions may ever eat of Him, and yet there is an abundance left. Here we have an evidence of the Divine authority of this record of which no man can rob us. The bread here was not Christ in person, but Christ in the word. To the great mass of mankind the Bible is of no more value than a barley loaf; and yet to those who have eaten of it, and found it the bread of life, it has increased in value, and the more they study its sacred pages, the more its beauties appear, until the book becomes the pearl of great price, and the possessor would be willing to exchange the kingdoms of the world, if he possessed them, for such a treasure.

It is stated that there were five thousand fed, besides women and children. Five thousand being a number which would represent the sanctified, the women and children would represent the discipleship, or to extend the figure still farther, may be a faint shadow of the reception of the Gentiles in the coming dispensation.

The statement that there were twelve baskets full of fragments taken up, appears to refer to the perfect

satisfaction of the Church, procuring her complete salvation, and an overplus, in which twelve apostles are filled to overflowing with the word in readiness to carry it out to the Gentile world when the door is opened for them to do so. Twelve baskets full was evidently a much larger quantity than they had at the beginning, and yet notice how careful our Savior is that none should be lost. He who gives us our daily bread, He who supplies us our time, and all we possess, requires of us that we waste nothing. Why this care of the fragments, when Almighty power can create a world of bread as big as the planet Jupiter just as easy as He could create a single loaf?

Is it not to teach us the value of our dependence on Him, and not the value of the article itself? Take a child, for example, who has been raised in wealth, and he knows nothing of the value of money. If his parents die, and he suddenly comes into possession of what appears to him to be unlimited wealth, he will spend it in a few months. He knows nothing of its value, and only learns what it is when it is gone, and he is reduced to beggary; and not until he finds how much it costs to earn food enough for a week's supply, does he learn the worth of the fortune that he has foolishly squandered. Whereas, on the other hand, the child who has to work hard for every toy he buys, or every dime he spends on a holiday, learns the value of money, and in later years he will take good care of that which has cost him so much hard labor. And so it is in the religious or spiritual world. If God would supply

our wants by miracle, as Christ supplied these five thousand men with bread, we should never appreciate His kingdom.

It is only by passing through a world of trial and pain and suffering, earning our daily bread by the sweat of our brow, that we shall learn to appreciate the value of that world where all our wants shall be supplied by eternal miracle.

Before leaving this subject, I will just notice a rationalist theory, which explains the whole without any difficulty. This company on their way to Jerulem had a supply of provisions, but kept them hid for their own use. Many who had no provisions were in want. Jesus willingly divides His own little morsel, which they had just bought for their own use. The example was contagious. Those having provisions suddenly became generous, and they brought out so many pieces of bread and fish that there were enough to fill twelve large baskets, from which all feasted to their entire satisfaction. The passage "fragments that remained," they would translate "fragments that were gathered;" that is, from the company. But those of us who believe that Christ is God have no need to resort to so miserable a subterfuge as this. The creator of the universe can create bread when and where He will. Christ, the Bread of Life, is an inexhaustible supply. Reader, will He be our supply through eternity?

CHRIST WALKING ON THE SEA.

"And straightway Jesus constrained His disciples to get into a a ship, and to go before Him unto the other side, while He sent the multitudes away. And when He had sent the multitudes away, He went up into a mountain apart to pray: and when the evening was come, He was there alone. But the ship was now in the midst of the sea, tossed with waves: for the wind was contrary. And in the fourth watch of the night Jesus went unto them, walking on the sea. And when the disciples saw Him walking on the sea, they were troubled, saying, It is a spirit; and they cried out for fear. But straightway Jesus spake unto them, saying, Be of good cheer; it is I; be not afraid. And Peter answered Him and said, Lord, if it be Thou, bid me come unto Thee on the water. And He said, Come. And when Peter was come down out of the ship, he walked on the water, to go to Jesus. But when he saw the wind boisterous, he was afraid; and beginning to sink, he cried, saying, Lord, save me. And immediately Jesus stretched forth His hand, and caught him, and said unto him, O thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt? And when they were come into the ship, the wind ceased. Then they that were in the ship came and worshipped Him, saying. Of a truth Thou art the Son of God."—MATT. xiv. 22–33.

HERE, again, we have a miracle in intimate connection with the sea. In all these miracles in which the sea occupies a prominent part, I find such an intimate relationship that I feel very much inclined to believe that they were all designed to teach one and the same lesson, in its different phases, as I find the same analogies running through them all.

"*Jesus constrained His disciples to get into a ship.*" There is an indication here that Christ had some difficulty in persuading His disciples to enter the ship, at least such I understand to be the meaning of the word "constrained." John explains this by

telling us that the reason why He went into the mountain alone was, that "He perceived that they would come and take Him by force and make Him a king." So we may readily suppose that His disciples did not wish to be separated from Him on this occasion, but would much rather have remained with Him; for if during their absence the people made Him a king, they might be overlooked, and not obtain those high positions in His new kingdom which they so earnestly wished for. They no doubt understood well how earthly sovereigns, on such occasions, do not at all times comply with the strict rules of justice in granting their favors, but are often liable to forget old friends and grant their favors to newcomers, who, although far less worthy, make greater pretensions, and carry away the prize through persuasion and deception. Hence, upon the principle of being served first, they wished to remain with Him.

"*And when He had sent the multitudes away, He went up into a mountain apart to pray; and when the evening was come, He was there alone.*" Here we find Jesus praying alone in the mountain. We are not told what the prayer was which He offered to God; whether he prayed for Himself, or for His disciples. The inference, however, is, that it was for His disciples. Whatever this prayer was, we know, from the fact that it was delivered in secret and alone, that it was not an example or pattern given to the disciples, like the Lord's Prayer, but something that concerned Jesus alone. I consider these prayers as part of His work on earth as a

gospel minister, in which He was, in all probability, engaged in interceding for His disciples.

"*The ship was now in the midst of the sea, tossed with waves; for the wind was contrary.*" Mark says, "And He saw them toiling in rowing: for the wind was contrary unto them." Alone in prayer in the mountain, He was still in spirit with His disciples. "He saw them toiling," although He was not personally with them, and hence the inference that He was praying for them. Becoming so intensely interested in their welfare, His human sympathy going out through the darkness towards them, He is at once precipitated bodily across the waters, and appears in their presence. Has the Divine in this instance so combined with the human that it operates in unison with it, and carries Him safely down the mountain side and across the stormy waves to His suffering, toiling disciples? We here find a perfect analogy between the condition of this ship and the old covenant Church. Christ was not at all times personally in human form present with the ancient Church. They, too, passed through a long, stormy night, in which they toiled in rowing, for the wind was contrary. We must remember that the ship or vessel spoken of here was very different from our yachts in present use on our lakes and rivers. Sails could be used in fine weather, but in stormy weather sailors were provided with oars, and sat in *banks* or rows above each other, the upper bank having the longest oars. It was hard personal effort, which produced but little progress. Three watches of the night had passed away, and but little had been

gained. Moses and the judges, the kings and the prophets, had occupied the first three watches of the night, and now they are in the last watch before morning, or between three and six o'clock. John's mission had been already established, and the disciples had taken it, and were now laboring with but little progress, and no prospect of advancement from their own efforts. "*In the fourth watch of the night*" they had accomplished no more than "*five and twenty or thirty furlongs*," only about half their journey across, when they see Him "*walking upon the sea.*"

In a former miracle we have Christ with His disciples in a storm, but He is asleep; but in this case He sends them out alone, while He remains on the mountain to pray.

"*He would have passed by them*," says Mark. How often does Jesus apparently pass us by in order to try our faith. Going with the disciples to Emmaus, He made as though He would have gone farther. This was to try them. Did they want His company, or did they not? He would pass them by, but upon the first intimation that His company is wanted, He is willing to remain with them.

"*And when the disciples saw Him walking on the sea, they were troubled, saying, It is a spirit; and they cried out for fear.*" How are we to understand this? Was it a mere superstition on the part of the disciples? Was it a superstition which they had derived from the pagans around them, or are there spirits in the air, which have the power of rendering themselves visible to human eyes?

"*Jesus spake unto them, saying, Be of good cheer; it is I; be not afraid.*" In that moment, when their hearts were about to sink within them, a well-known voice comes through the darkness, saying, "Be of good cheer; it is I; be not afraid." If Christ be the Jehovah—the Creator, the one only God—we then have verified in this act the words of the ancient seer, "He alone spreadeth out the heavens, and treadeth upon the waves of the sea." (Job ix. 8.)

"*And Peter answered Him, and said, Lord, if it be Thou, bid me come unto Thee on the water. And He said, Come. And when Peter was come down out of the ship, he walked on the water, to go to Jesus.*" Here we have a manifestation of that peculiar, impulsive character of Peter,—his boldness; his rashness. He does not for a moment think of the consequence. He does not stop to think whether he can walk on the water or not. "*Bid me come to Thee.*" Observe his language; he does not say bid *us*, but bid *me*. *I*, Peter, am of great importance. I am the *rock*, the first of all the disciples. They have no rights which I am bound to respect until *my* desires are granted. This was the same spirit that he manifested on another occasion, when he said, "Although all men forsake Thee, *I* will not," not for a moment considering what would be the result of such a rash promise. The biggest idol in his breast was *I*. One would have supposed that the egotism which he manifested on this occasion, and which came so near proving ruinous to him, would have taught him a lesson that would have restrained him hereafter, and that he would

not have madly rushed into the same difficulty a second time; but such men seldom learn wisdom from experience. Alas! for poor Peter's egotism, which placed him before all the other disciples. How soon was it sadly humbled. "Bid me come *to Thee*." Christ does not bid him come to Himself. Peter's request was not fully granted; Christ merely says "come," not "come to Me." Come if you will; come if you can. If you imagine that you can walk these stormy waters, come on.

"*And He said, Come. And when Peter was come down out of the ship, he walked on the water to go to Jesus. But when he saw the wind boisterous, he was afraid; and beginning to sink, he cried, saying, Lord, save me.*" Here we see at once that the miracle was not alone confined to our Lord, as by one who, by some magic art, had learned to walk upon the sea as upon a solid pavement. We have heard of persons who, by means of immense cork soles, or rubber bags filled with air, and a long staff to keep them upright, have, with great difficulty, been able to walk upon smooth, shallow water, but not one, by any such invention, has yet learned to walk upon a boisterous sea. Now, we see this power also conferred to Peter; but is it in Peter, or is it in the water? Dana commences his mineralogy by saying that all that has not life is a mineral. Water, he says, is as much a mineral as mercury, or a piece of granite. The only difference is that they are solid at different temperatures. It requires a greater degree of heat to melt granite than it does ice. Now, was there some mysterious power imparted to the

water under Peter's feet that transformed it into ice? He who created the ocean could easily congeal a portion of the sea of Galilee at His will. The psalmist tells us that, when Israel passed through the Red Sea, "the waters were congealed."

"*But when he saw the wind boisterous, he was afraid; and beginning to sink, he cried, saying, Lord, save me. And immediately Jesus stretched forth His hand, and caught him, and said unto him, O thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt.*" Peter's courage did not last long; but if he had trusted fully, believing in his heart that Jesus would take care of him, there would have been no need of his saying "Lord, save me," but over the dark, tumultuous waves, into the arms of Jesus, that were waiting to receive him, he would have gone in safety.

Peter, being a fisherman, knew how to swim. In one instance we are told that "he girded his fisherman's coat about him, and cast himself into the sea." But a man may be a good swimmer in smooth water, and yet be unable to keep himself afloat in a storm. When he saw the wind boisterous, he was afraid. *He began to sink*, and would have sunk, had not a powerful arm been stretched out at that moment to save him. And then, finding himself sinking beneath the stormy waves, he cries, "Lord, save me; and immediately Jesus stretched forth His hand and caught him."

"*O thou of little faith.*" He does not accuse him of having no faith, and yet his faith was not sufficient.

"*And when they were come into the ship, the wind ceased.*" John adds to this, "And immediately the

ship was at the land whither they went." Now, notice, as soon as Jesus was in the ship it was calm, and the twenty or thirty furlongs which they had yet to go were accomplished immediately, although they had been up to this point toiling the greater part of the night against a contrary wind. Now, I wish you to notice that a double lesson is here taught, or rather the same lesson is repeated, presented to us in two different forms, that of the ship itself, and of Peter. This is the same lesson that we have been studying all through the Old Testament. Peter starts out boldly in his own strength, walks well for a time, and then sinks; sinking, an almighty arm saves him. The ship starts out upon a calm sea, but soon a storm arises. By their own personal effort they cannot bring her to land; but when their own strength is exhausted, the Lord Jesus appears. The storm is hushed, and the ship is immediately at the end of her journey.

Israel, well drilled under Moses and Joshua, starts out bravely upon the wide sea of the pagan world. Nobly those ancient mariners, whose names are recorded in the history of Israel from Joshua to John the Baptist, toil to keep the law. They labor to keep the law, and by the law to gain the promised haven; but "by the law shall no flesh be justified." But when Christ in the Comforter, the Holy Ghost, came into the storm-tossed ship, there was a calm, and they were at once carried into the kingdom of God, without any effort of their own. As is the Jewish nation, so is the individual. As is the ship of Christ, so is the disciple. He starts out boldly

from the ship of family restraint in which he spent his childhood years, and for a short distance he walks calmly over the world's great sea of doubt, and trusting himself in his own strength to keep the law, feels secure; but when he sees the stormy waves of passion which surround him, and the power the prince of the air has over the winds of false doctrine, he finds his own strength inadequate to the terrible ordeal, his faith begins to waver, and he cries, "Lord, save me, or I perish!"

And when all human power has failed, when he has learned that he cannot keep the law by human strength, then a supernatural, a divine hand is stretched through the darkness, rescuing him from the world's ruin, and making him walk safely by his risen Lord, in peace, and in happiness and safety. May we all learn to trust Him who saved Peter from a watery grave, that He may save us from the powers of hell.

CHRIST HEALING A BLIND MAN.

"Jesus said unto them, If ye were blind, ye should have no sin: but now ye say, we see, therefore your sin remaineth."—JOHN ix. 41.

RIGHT in the midst of persecution we find Jesus doing good. The last verse of the eighth chapter tells us that the Jews took up stones to cast at Him, and now we find Him healing a blind man. "And as Jesus passed by, He saw a man which was blind

from his birth. And His disciples asked Him, saying, Master, who did sin, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?" (Verses 1–2.)

It appears to have been very generally known that this man had been blind from his birth. Whether the disciples had known this man for a long time, or whether some one had lately told them, they appear to be familiar with the fact. It is a very strange question which the disciples ask our Lord here. They had been taught, no doubt, from infancy to connect sin and suffering together as cause and result, and now they find themselves greatly puzzled to make an application in this case. If this man was born blind because his parents sinned, then the Scriptures do not speak the truth, which tell us that the child shall not be punished for the father's sins. Then how could this man sin before he was born? Some have supposed that they thought that the man was punished beforehand for some sin that he would commit in after years. Others thought that the Jews believed in a transmigration of souls, and that this man's soul had sinned while in some former state or body, and that he was now being punished for it. The fact is, the disciples were laboring under an error in supposing that physical suffering was the result of sin. This error is universally prevalent everywhere to-day, although Christ on this occasion declared against it.

"*Jesus answered, Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents, but that the works of God should be made manifest in him.*" Here we have the solution of the whole difficulty. It was neither this man's

sins, nor those of his parents, that had made him blind, but that the works of God should be made manifest in him. A sinful nature he had inherited from Adam, like all the rest of us, but that sinful nature had not deprived him of sight any more than it had Peter, James, or John. As far as this was concerned, they were all on a level, and it was no personal sin that had made him blind. True, he was different from others in being born into a more severe state of suffering, but then in His own good time God will manifest His works in him, and with equal justice make all things right in the end.

"*I must work the works of Him that sent Me, while it is day; the night cometh when no man can work. As long as I am in the world, I am the Light of the world.*" No right meaning can be gained from these words, unless we look upon Christ in His proper mission while in the flesh, that of a true gospel minister. To-day is the day of His labor—His true work-day; soon the hour will come when He will be put to death, and then this peculiar mission will cease. In the language here used, He speaks not only for Himself, but for every minister of the gospel. He must work while it is day, for the night cometh when His mission must cease. As Christ is the Light of the world, His ministers are a reflection of that light—a light upon a candlestick, to give light to others; a city set upon a hill, which cannot be hid.

"*When He had thus spoken, He spat on the ground, and made clay of the spittle, and He anointed the eyes of the blind man with the clay.*" Why clay and

spittle? Why not some other element? The verses which precede this undoubtedly refer to the gospel ministry, and this must be a continuance of the same. The spittle would lead one to suppose that something was indicated as proceeding from the minister's mouth—his words, his teachings, his counsel, instruction and advice. This mixed with clay. Clay is a type of that which is carnal, earthy, from which man's body was formed. A plaster of this kind applied to a blind man's eyes would only increase the difficulty; such is the case with the old covenant.

This would have been our condition had we no more than Moses. Moses alone is but a plaster of clay and saliva to blind eyes, and the more we put on the deeper our sin grows, the darker the night within.

"*And said unto him, Go, wash in the pool of Siloam, (which is by interpretation, Sent.) He went his way, therefore, and washed, and came seeing.*" A celebrated commentator (Olshausen) has committed a very strange error in commenting on this verse. He says that Christ was not the one sent, but the sender. The blind man was the one sent. No, no, no! Christ Himself is the one sent of God, the true Siloam to wash all sin from blind eyes. Siloam and Shiloh are all the same. Those who tell us that there is no typical meaning attached to these miracles, will please tell us why the interpretation of the word "Siloam" is here given? As Trench says, it would do very well in a lexicon, but not in a gospel, unless it has a special significance.

Blind in sin, the first teachings we receive only re-

veal to us our sad condition, only covering our eyes up with a plaster of clay; but we wash in Shiloh, that living fountain, Christ, and behold, our eyes are opened. That Christ is the one sent is clearly indicated in His name, "Shiloh," as well as in the words of Paul, who calls Him "the Apostle of our profession," (Heb. iii. 1,) the word "apostle" meaning "one sent." He came to open blind eyes, to reveal the light of Divine truth, the truth of God's mercy and love. Moses did not. He clothed the Almighty with clouds and thick darkness; received His commandments to men from amidst thunder and flames, and revealed hardly more than His attributes of justice and immutability—the very attributes that discourage most the hopes of men. So, a great commentator, like Olshausen, though learned and scholarly, may greatly err. How well for us that the Bible was not written by men uninspired by the Spirit of God. How often would they have confounded the great truths upon which our salvation is based, making Christ the sender, rather than the sent of God—teaching errors as grave as if they made the sun to rise in the West and set in the East.

This man now goes as directed, washes in the pool of Siloam; his eyes are opened, and he returns to his own house; but not to remain long in the quiet, peaceful enjoyment of this new blessing. Satan wants to see us unhappy, and if we are not so, he will soon seek the means to make us so, and, as is often the case, using our own neighbors as the instruments.

This man's neighbors took him to the Pharisees,

with what object in view we are not told. It may have been to prove that Jesus was the Christ, or it may have been with an entirely opposite purpose in view. This miracle was done on the Sabbath day. There was at once a division among them, part claiming that if He were a sinner, He could do no such miracle, and part claiming that no holy person would do such a miracle on the Sabbath day. That He opened this man's eyes on the Sabbath day was proof to them that the miracle was from Satan, and not from God. But they were willingly ignorant of the great truth that Christ was superior to the law. Indeed, He was the Author of the law. His act, therefore, was an interpretation of the law, and not a violation of it. As water washes away clay, so the life and teachings of Christ clear away the mysteries that obscure the law of Moses.

"*They say unto the blind man again, What sayest thou of Him, that He hath opened thine eyes? He said, He is a Prophet.*" This should be, "What sayest thou of Him, in that He hath opened thine eyes?" that is, about this matter of having opened thine eyes.

"*But the Jews did not believe concerning him, that he had been blind and received his sight, until they called the parents of him that had received his sight.*" Then he relates the whole affair to them. No doubt they watched him closely, hoping to find some proof that it was done by Satanic agency. First, they will not believe that he was born blind, and they call his parents; but the result is that they only prove that he was born blind. The parents are not willing to

say anything about his recovering his sight. They were afraid that, if they told the truth, they would be excommunicated from the synagogue, and that would cut them off from their friends and relatives about as much as it would if they had incurred some bodily defilement, such as leprosy; consequently they answer, "Our son is of age, ask him." Probably, in the examination of the parents they had sent the son out, and now they recall him for a cross questioning; and like some unscrupulous lawyers, pretend that they have information which they do not possess, but expect to obtain from the witness by this false pretense.

"*Then again called they the man that was blind, and said unto him, Give God the praise, we know that this man is a sinner.*" "Give God the praise" rather leads astray. It does not mean, give God the praise, and not this man Jesus; but it means, make an open confession to God; conceal nothing, for fear of God's displeasure. (Josh. vii. 19.)

They now have an important piece of information. "We know that this man is a sinner." No doubt the witness thought to himself, "Lying scoundrels, you know nothing about it; but one thing I know, I was born blind, and now I see;" and this he tells them. Draw what inference you choose from this. "Then said they to him again, What did He to thee? How opened He thine eyes? He answered them, I have told you already, and ye did not hear, wherefore would ye hear it again? Will ye also be His disciples?"

The man is now beginning to get tired of this

nonsense. "I have told you once, why should I tell you again? If I convince you, will you become His disciples?" No; they did not want to be convinced. That was the last thing in the world. A string of solid argument that would reach from here to the moon would not convince them. What they wanted, and the only thing they wanted, was something that would convict and condemn Jesus.

"*Then they reviled him, and said, Thou art His disciple, but we are Moses' disciples. We know that God spake unto Moses, as for this fellow we know not from whence he is.*" They do not know from whence he is. Then why did they say they did? They had just said we know that this man is a sinner, as much as to say we know that he is from beneath, and now they confess that they know nothing about it.

"*The man answered and said unto them, Why, herein is a marvellous thing, that ye know not from whence He is, and yet He hath opened mine eyes. Now we know that God heareth not sinners; but if any man be a worshipper of God, and doeth His will, him He heareth. Since the world began was it not heard that any man opened the eyes of one that was born blind. If this man were not of God, He could do nothing.*" The great difficulty appears to be just this: The Jews had despised this man, and here a wonderful miracle had been performed, that could alone be done by divine agency, and on the Sabbath day. Now they must accept one of the two horns of a dilemma: acknowledge Him Lord of the Sabbath day, or declare that the miracle was performed by

the power of Beelzebub. If the former is true, their lofty pride will have a fall like that of Lucifer.

"*They answered and said unto him, Thou wast altogether born in sins, and dost thou teach us? And they cast him out.*" Before, they would not believe that he was born blind. Now they suddenly believe that he was; for it is from that fact that they learn that he was altogether born in sins. And should a sinner teach them? What, teach these holy liars? The fact is, they did not believe the truth. They did not know it, and they did not want to know it.

"*Jesus heard that they cast him out; and when He had found him, He said unto him, Dost thou believe on the Son of God? He answered and said, Who is He, Lord, that I might believe on Him? And Jesus said unto him, Thou hast both seen Him, and it is He that talketh with thee. And he said, Lord, I believe. And he worshipped Him.*" The man now learns who his benefactor is—the Lord of the Sabbath day.

"*And Jesus said, For judgment I am come into this world, that they which see not might see, and that they which see might be made blind. And some of the Pharisees which were with Him heard these words, and said unto Him, Are we blind also? Jesus said unto them, If ye were blind, ye should have no sin; but now ye say, We see, therefore your sin remaineth.*" Had they not been blind they would have seen Christ's superiority to Moses. They were not Moses' disciples.

THE SABBATH DAY.—CHRIST RESTORING THE WITHERED HAND.

"And He entered again into the synagogue; and there was a man there which had a withered hand. And they watched Him, whether He would heal him on the Sabbath day; that they might accuse Him. And He saith unto the man which had the withered hand, Stand forth. And He saith unto them, Is it lawful to do good on the Sabbath days, or to do evil? to save life, or to kill? But they held their peace. And when He had looked round about on them with anger, being grieved for the hardness of their hearts, He saith unto the man, Stretch forth thine hand. And he stretched it out: and his hand was restored whole as the other. And the Pharisees went forth, and straightway took counsel with the Herodians against Him, how they might destroy Him."—MARK iii. 1–6.

THIS miracle was performed on the Sabbath day. In fact, many of Christ's miracles were performed on the Sabbath. It is distinctly recorded of seven of Christ's miracles that He performed them on the Sabbath day, and there are intimations that many more were performed on this day.

This miracle follows immediately upon the accusation that the Pharisees brought against Jesus because His disciples had gathered, and probably roasted, (according to the Eastern custom,) the green ears of wheat on the Sabbath, as recorded in Matthew xii. 1–2: "At that time Jesus went on the Sabbath day through the corn; and His disciples were an hungered, and began to pluck the ears of corn, and to eat. But when the Pharisees saw it, they said unto Him, Behold, Thy disciples do that which is not lawful to do upon the Sabbath day." They did not complain that He had invaded some one's pro-

perty, because this was permitted by the law. The Mosaic law allowed a man to go into another man's field and eat all he wanted, but would not allow him to thrust in his sickle. He could go into his vineyard and eat as many grapes as he pleased, but he must carry none away. But they complained that the disciples had broken the Sabbath day in satisfying their own hunger. These black-hearted scoundrels themselves were the ones that had broken the Sabbath day. Christ and His disciples were among them, curing the sick, healing the lame, and opening the eyes of the blind, and instead of affording them a good supply of provisions in return for their benevolent work, they let them starve until they are compelled to gather and make a meal of the new wheat, and then they complain to Christ that His disciples had broken the Sabbath day. On this occasion Jesus presents three arguments, derived from the Scriptures, to prove that there is already a higher law than that written on the tables of stone. First, one is in the Mosaic economy itself. The Sabbath day must give way to circumcision. If a child is born on the Sabbath day, on a Sabbath day it must be circumcised. Second, David partook of the shew bread, which was only lawful for the priests to eat. Here the claims of nature do away with the Levitical law. To satisfy hunger, David ate the shew-bread. Third, The priests at the altar fulfil their duties on the Sabbath. The Sabbath is inferior to, and must yield to the temple service. That of least importance must yield to the greater. The observance of the Sabbath day, even under the

Old Covenant economy, is inferior to the temple service. In fact, the non-observance of the latter would be the breaking of the former.

"But He said unto them, Have ye not read what David did when he was an hungered, and they that were with him; how he entered into the house of God, and did eat the shew-bread, which was not lawful for him to eat, neither for them which were with him, but only for the priests? Or have ye not read in the law how that on the Sabbath days the priests in the temple profane the Sabbath, and are blameless? But I say unto you, that in this place is one greater than the temple." (Matt. xii. 3–6.) But there is one here who is greater than the temple even, and if so, He must certainly be Lord of the Sabbath day. If He is greater than the temple, then He has a right to change the temple service if He sees fit to do so, and if it is His will, to do away with the Sabbath day. It was but a material temple that the Pharisees worshipped—nothing but the carnal; they could not see through and beyond a spiritual temple and a spiritual Sabbath, of which these were but the shadow.

"But if ye had known what this meaneth, I will have mercy and not sacrifice, ye would not have condemned the guiltless. For the Son of man is Lord, even of the Sabbath day." (Matt. xii. 7–8.) The passage, "*I will have mercy, and not sacrifice*," is not understood as it now stands. It would read better if translated "I require mercy, and not sacrifice." It is mercy that I want; your sacrifices are an abomination to Me. While you refuse to show

mercy to Me and Mine, your sacrifices are more polluting to Me than swine's flesh. While your hearts are so far from Me, I would rather have the breath of serpents and reptiles than the blood of your bulls and goats. If ye had known what God requires at your hands, ye would not have condemned the innocent.

And then He adds, according to Mark, "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath; therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath." The Sabbath was instituted to bless man, and is subject to man's representative. This language may be applied to the whole law. The law was made for man. Trench on the Miracles says: "The law was made for man, and not man for the law. Man is the end, and the ordinance of the law the means. Man was not made to the end that he might observe these, but these were given that they might bless man—that they might train and discipline him till he should be ready to serve God from the free impulse of his spirit." (Trench on the Miracles, page 255.)

I know that Paul says that Christ was made under the law, but then it is as man that He was under the law; as man's representative He is first made under the law, and then He rises above the law, and finally above all principalities and powers, and puts them under His feet. The law is man's school-master to bring him to Christ in regeneration, but after that, man's companion and counsellor.

Mark iii. 1–3: "*And He entered again into the synagogue; and there was a man there which had a*

withered hand. And they watched Him, whether He would heal him on the Sabbath day, that they might accuse Him. And He saith unto the man which had the withered hand, Stand forth." I understand, though I know not how true it is, that in eastern countries there is a disease which is occasionally met with, in which a limb—an arm or a leg—may become perfectly useless, lose all feeling, as in paralysis, and then dry up, nothing but skin and bone remaining, and then perfectly dead. No art of man can heal this disease. If it is true that this disease exists, then this man suffered with it. Now, if Christ had power to cure this man, then He had power to restore life to a dead man, and if so, even to a dead body, and was undoubtedly Lord of life and death. I do not deny that some of the ancient prophets assisted in raising the dead, but they never claimed this power as inherent in themselves. They ever attributed this power to God alone. Christ claims this power in Himself; and laying claim to it either proved Him divine, or it proved Him an imposter. No false prophet ever did or ever could claim the power openly and publicly to restore life to a dead limb. The whole undoubted testimony in this case was in favor of the divinity of Christ, and consequently prove Him Lord of the Sabbath day, with an undoubted right to do on that day whatsoever He chose to do.

"*And He saith unto them, Is it lawful to do good on the Sabbath days, or to do evil? to save life or to kill? But they held their peace. And when He had looked round about on them with anger, be-*

ing grieved for the hardness of their hearts, He saith unto the man, Stretch forth thine hand. And he stretched it out, and his hand was restored whole as the other." Matthew adds another question which Jesus asked them that Mark has omitted: "And behold, there was a man which had his hand withered. And they asked Him, saying, Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath days? that they might accuse Him. And He said unto them, What man shall there be among you, that shall have one sheep, and if it fall into a pit on the Sabbath day, will he not lay hold on it and lift it out? How much, then, is a man better than a sheep? Wherefore it is lawful to do well on the Sabbath days. Then saith He to the man, Stretch forth thine hand. And he stretched it forth, and it was restored whole like as the other." (Matt. xii. 10–13.)

The Mosaic law never prohibited works of mercy on the Sabbath day. The Pharisees had mistaken the whole drift of the Mosaic law. They professed to be disciples of Moses, and yet were as ignorant of Moses as are the disciples of Confucius. Moses' law reached no farther than the carnal man, outside of that it was no more binding than the laws of Lycurgus are upon American citizens. The laws of Moses are binding upon self, made to restrain *self*, to rule *self*, to *enslave* self, and the moment that we go out of self, to engage in works of mercy, Moses' law, like the two tables of stone that he hurled against the rocky sides of Sinai, falls shattered to atoms. When we become wholly absorbed in God's work and kingdom, Mount Sion arises in majestic

grandeur between us and Sinai, and the latter is hidden from our view for ever. The regenerated sinner must suffer the weakness of the flesh, the carnal nature, in which this selfishness exists; but the power of the law is broken, and can no longer be felt, except as we abandon the spirit and incline to the flesh, in which case the law becomes a counsellor; but if we walk in the Spirit, we are free from the law. "Christ looked upon them with anger, being grieved for the hardness of their hearts." A just indignation against wickedness is no sin. Pretending to be Moses' disciples, they had become the basest and vilest of idolaters. They had made an idol of Moses' law, and bowing to that idol they were worshipping it in the very presence, and under the just indignation, of the Son of God. May we ever entertain a just appreciation of Moses' law, but oh! may we never so idolize that law as to be unable to recognize the Son of God by His words and works. The miracle being performed, Luke tells us that "they were filled with madness." They were confounded and brought to shame. Convinced, but not converted, they were of the same opinion still. No power on earth could convert such men.

"*And the Pharisees went forth, and straightway took counsel with the Herodians against Him, how they might destroy Him.*" The Herodians were representatives of the Roman empire, and as such symbolical of the agencies of the empire of Satan. They are willing to sell themselves to their swine-eating, dogs-loving enemies, if they can by so doing destroy the Lord Jesus Christ. Herod and Pilate are enemies till

Christ is to be condemned. But when the Savior of the world is on trial, Jew and Gentile can readily join hands in condemning Him. A nominal Christian will burn a heretic as readily as a pagan will a Christian. Those who love not the Lord Jesus Christ are at heart one with Satan's kingdom, although for the sake of respectability, they may even pretend to be Christians in a Christian land; but let the hour of persecution come, let Christ and Christianity be placed upon trial in the prisoner's box, and we at once find them ranged with the enemies of the cross. So it was in the time of the Pharisees, and so it is to-day, and so it will be to the end of time.

CHRIST AND THE TEN LEPERS.

"And it came to pass, as He went to Jerusalem, that He passed through the midst of Samaria and Galilee. And as He entered into a certain village, there met Him ten men that were lepers, which stood afar off: and they lifted up their voices and said, Jesus, Master, have mercy on us. And when He saw them, He said unto them, Go show yourselves unto the priests. And it came to pass, that, as they went, they were cleansed. And one of them, when he saw that he was healed, turned back, and with a loud voice glorified God, and fell down on his face at His feet, giving Him thanks: and he was a Samaritan. And Jesus answering said, Were there not ten cleansed? but where are the nine? There are not found that returned to give glory to God, save this stranger. And He said unto Him, Arise, go thy way: thy faith hath made thee whole."—Luke xvii. 11–19.

Three times a year all the males of the nation of Israel were required to present themselves at the temple of Jerusalem. At the time of our Savior, the kingdom of Israel was divided into three parts:

Judea, Samaria, and Galilee. The people of Samaria were a sort of mongrel Jews. Half Jew and half pagan, they were not permitted to assemble with the other Jews in Jerusalem, and as a natural consequence had built for themselves a temple in Mount Gerizim. This naturally caused great trouble to the people in Galilee, who had to pass through Samaria in order to get to Jerusalem. As people in those times travelled mostly on foot, probably the most public roads through Samaria would be filled at the time of these feasts with people on their way to Jerusalem, either travelling alone or in companies. On these journeys they usually engaged in singing the Psalms of David—psalms of degrees. We can readily understand the animosity that would naturally be excited in the minds of the Samaritans on seeing a people that they looked upon as their enemies travelling thus, perhaps for several days at a time, three seasons in the year, through their country, singing religious songs, and turning their backs upon their temple in Mount Gerizim. This animosity grew so strong that they not only had no dealings with the Jews, as the New Testament tells us, but they often committed acts of open violence upon the Galileans, and Josephus records an instance in which they massacred many of them. These acts of violence became so frequent that many of the Galileans preferred to cross the Jordan and pass down the east side of it, then re-cross it at Jericho, thus making a great detour around in order to avoid passing through Samaria. But it appears that Jesus, instead of avoiding the danger by taking the longer route,

passed through Samaria with His disciples on His way to Jerusalem.

"*And it came to pass, as He went to Jerusalem, that He passed through the midst of Samaria and Galilee. And as He entered into a certain village, there met Him ten men that were lepers, which stood afar off: and they lifted up their voices and said, Jesus, Master, have mercy on us.*" Common misery had drawn these men together. If these men had had their health, they would have been enemies; for we read that one was a Samaritan. Men may be enemies to each other in prosperity, but when they all alike fall into disgrace and misery, the petty animosities which divide them are all forgotten—sin makes them all equal. According to the law of Moses, these lepers stood afar off. They, no doubt, had heard of Jesus. The wonderful miracles that He had performed had been published throughout the land. Probably knowing that He had power to cure the leprosy, they cry, "Master, have mercy on us!"

"*And when He saw them, He said unto them, Go shew yourselves unto the priests. And it came to pass, that, as they went, they were cleansed.*" An extraordinary amount of faith was required here. Christ did not call these lepers to Him, and lay His hands upon them and pronounce them cured; but He sent them away to the priests, whose office was, not to cure, but to pronounce them clean when they were cured, and perform for them the ceremonies which would again admit them to the privileges of their nation. If they had presented themselves to

the priests as they were, he would undoubtedly have turned them away; and the very fact that they started off on this mission shows that they expected to be healed on the way. And as their faith was, so it was done unto them. "As they went, they were cleansed."

"*And one of them, when he saw that he was healed, turned back, and with a loud voice glorified God, and fell down on his face at His feet, giving Him thanks: and he was a Samaritan.*" Leprosy is a disease of the skin. Sometimes the whole body will be covered with sores; sometimes only a portion of the body will be thus affected. It causes the skin to look white, like snow, and is a very loathsome, contagious disease. When a person is found to have this disease, he is made to live by himself, or with others who are likewise its unfortunate victims. Some have supposed that this Samaritan had already been to the temple and offered the customary sacrifice, but of that there is no evidence. The language of the text would rather indicate that he turned back immediately on finding himself healed of so loathsome a disease.

Although the Samaritans were looked upon by the other Jews as so many Gentiles, yet I think that in our Savior's time there was no prohibition against any Samaritan taking part in all the ceremonies and services of the Jews, if he wished to do so. In fact, that he should join with the other nine in going to the temple to pass through the usual ceremonies of purification, I think proves that no Samaritan would be forbidden entrance to the temple, provided he

came in the legitimate way, *i. e.*, according to the requirements of the Mosaic law.

"*And Jesus answering said, Were there not ten cleansed? but where are the nine? There are not found that returneth to give glory to God, save this stranger. And He said unto him, Arise, go thy way, thy faith hath made thee whole.*" (Vs. 17–19.) Oh, the ungrateful human heart! Ten were healed of a loathsome disease, but only one of the ten returns to give thanks for the blessing he had received; and that one is rather the representative of the Gentile world, while the ungrateful nine belong to the people of God, to whom the oracles of God had been given. We read this account, and we think it strange that these nine lepers should be so ungrateful, but they represent fully nine-tenths of the human race.

The greatest obstacle that the missionary has to encounter is the ingratitude of the people whom he is endeavouring to bring to a knowledge of a Savior. Let a missionary go into some town in Mexico, and the people will flock around him, and beg of him to send them a preacher; the preacher sent, they then beg for a church; the church built, they beg for a school; and it must be a free school, for not one red cent will they pay to support either church, minister or teacher; and then they will turn around and curse you to your face because you do not send them bread and clothing to keep them in idleness.

Sad as this picture is, I have not overdrawn it; nor is this an isolated case. It was my daily experience for over five years. And did I choose to oc-

cupy your time, I could recount many incidents to prove this. In fact, acts of ingratitude were of daily occurrence.

But this want of ingratitude is not confined to the missionary field. We find it in the world, and we find it in the Church.

We find it in the world. The whole race of Adam is groaning under the terrible leprosy of sin. A cure has been prepared, a sacrifice has been offered, that will cleanse this filthy disease. Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, has suffered the terrible death of the cross for sinners. And oh! how many of the millions of our race have sufficient gratitude to acknowledge Him as their Savior! Present them with the gospel—the glad news of cleansing blood—and like filthy swine they will trample it under their feet, and turn and rend you.

We find it in the Church. The sinner, awakened by a terrible sense of sin, which, like a devouring leprosy, is carrying him down, not to the grave, but even far lower than the grave, feels his need of a Savior. It may be that, like the nine Jews, he has been brought up within the shade of Jerusalem's temple, and knows all about the gospel plan of salvation, but till now has never felt the need of it; or it may be that, like the Samaritan, he has had his early training within sight of the temple upon Mt. Gerizim, in the shade of a false religion, and knows but very little about God's word; yet some keen shaft has pierced his breast, and suddenly revealed to his spiritual vision the terrible deformity within; and in all the agony of a lost soul sinking into end-

less despair, he cries out, "Master, have mercy on us." The Savior is passing by, as He ever is, in search of the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and at once tells him how he may be saved. He at once starts off in hot haste upon the journey; and as he goes, he feels his sins forgiven, and we may say at once he is a true convert. He will turn and follow Christ as a disciple, and return Him thanks by spending his whole life in His service! Nothing of the kind; he merely fulfils the law's demands, and no more. He shows himself to the priest in the temple, and offers the necessary sacrifice, and goes through the usual ceremonies of cleansing; and what more?—the rest of his life is a blank; he is never heard from again. Do you know what this means? He joins the Church; gets a pew, and every Lord's day shows himself to his minister; he pays his sacrifice of one dollar, two dollars, or it may be five, or even ten dollars, for preaching; has been baptized, and partakes of the communion; and beyond that he is of no more service to Christ's kingdom than he would be if buried at the bottom of the sea. He never offers a prayer in public; he never teaches a child in the Sunday-school; never speaks to his neighbor about his soul's salvation; never reads or loans a religious book; never contributes to any benevolent enterprise; vegetates from year to year, without ever thinking that he has been ungrateful to that Savior.

THE SYROPHENICIAN WOMAN.

"Then Jesus went thence, and departed into the coasts of Tyre and Sidon. And, behold, a woman of Canaan came out of the same coasts, and cried unto Him, saying, Have mercy on me, O Lord, thou Son of David; my daughter is grievously vexed with a devil. But He answered her not a word. And His disciples came and besought Him saying, Send her away; for she crieth after us. But He answered and said, I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel. Then came she and worshipped Him, saying, Lord, help me. But He answered and said, It is not meet to take the children's bread, and to cast it to dogs. And she said, Truth, Lord: yet the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their masters' table. Then Jesus answered and said unto her, O woman, great is thy faith: be it unto thee even as thou wilt. And her daughter was made whole from that very hour."—MATT. xv. 21–28.

WE have no evidence in the Scriptures that Christ, during His public ministry, ever went out of the land of Canaan. In His childhood, it is true, He was carried by His parents down into Egypt. The only passage that would afford any indication that He went out of Canaan during His public ministry is now before us; and I think, if we examine it closely, we will find that it affords none.

"*Then Jesus went thence, and departed into the coasts of Tyre and Sidon.*" The word "coasts" here means *that portion of country bordering on the frontier.* There is no evidence that He crossed over the boundary line into Tyre and Sidon. That the word "coasts" here means the frontier, is evident from the fact that the Canaanitish woman "came out of the same coast." "And, behold, a woman of Canaan came out of the same coasts, and cried unto Him, saying, Have mercy on me, O Lord, Thou Son

of David; my daughter is grievously vexed with a devil." That is, she came out from her side of the line over into the land of Canaan, both sides being called the coasts. That He should say, "*I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel*," appears to me to be abundant proof that He did not cross over into the land of Tyre and Sidon.

Mark says, "And would have no man know it; but He could not be hid," upon which Trench beautifully comments, that He was like precious ointment, which cannot be hid, but betrayeth its presence wherever it may be.

"*And, behold, a woman of Canaan came out of the same coasts, and cried unto Him, saying, Have mercy on me, O Lord, Thou Son of David, my daughter is grievously vexed with a devil.*" Matthew calls her a woman of Canaan, to indicate, no doubt, that she belonged to that ancient race which had been doomed to destruction, but some of which had escaped the devouring sword of Joshua, and through all ages down to Christ's time had been a thorn in the side of Israel. Mark calls her "a Greek, a Syrophenician," indicating probably that she spoke the Greek language, and was a native of Phœnicia, in Syria.

Although this woman was a Gentile pagan, yet she appears to have a much clearer view of the mission and claims of the Messiah than many of His own brethren did. She calls Him "Lord," and "Son of David," recognizing His divine mission and His Messiahship, as King of Israel.

"*But He answered her not a word. And His dis-*

ciples came and besought Him, saying, Send her away, for she crieth after us." I am rather inclined to think, from the answer which Christ gave His disciples, that they expected that He would grant her request. Her continued crying had become an annoyance to them, and was doubtless attracting attention.

This poor, despised Syrophenician does not find our Savior, at first, the kind, benevolent, compassionate healer of the sick and afflicted that others had found Him. For a time He remains silent, and then insinuates that she is a Canaanitish dog, thus making her feel the whole weight of ignorance and reproach that the Jews had for ages cast upon her people. But I think the principal object our Savior had in view was to teach His disciples a wholesome lesson, that even of these Canaanitish dogs God could raise up seed unto Abraham.

"*But He answered and said, I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel.* In what sense can it be said that Christ was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel? Does He not say Himself to the believers in Israel, "Other sheep I have, which are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they shall hear My voice, and there shall be one fold and one Shepherd." Has not all prophecy pointed forward to Him in whom all nations should be blessed?—to Him in whom the Gentiles should trust?—who should be a Light to lighten the Gentiles? How is it, then, that He is "sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel"?

There can be no difficulty about this question if

we take into consideration that Christ is not speaking here of His mission as the Savior of the world, but of His mission as a gospel minister; as Paul says, "Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers." He was "a minister of the circumcision," that is, of the seed of Abraham, the house of Israel; but we are nowhere told that He was a gospel minister unto the Gentiles.

"*Then came she and worshipped Him, saying, Lord, help me. But He answered and said, It is not meet to take the children's bread, and to cast it to dogs.*" Mark says that He told her, "Let the *children first be filled;* for it is not meet to take the children's bread and cast it unto dogs"—thus indicating that the time had not yet come when the Gentiles should be invited to the Lord's table. After the children had been fed, then the dogs will be allowed to help themselves from—shall I say, the twelve basketsful of fragments? After the five thousand were fed, there were twelve basketsful remaining; the disciples were commanded to gather them up, that nothing be wasted; so, after the children (the Jews) had been fed by the Master, there were fragments left. He said: "I have many things to say to you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit, when He, the Spirit of truth is come, He will guide you into all truth; for He shall not speak of Himself; but whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak, and He will shew you things to come." (John xvi. 12–13.) He left many things unsaid, but to the twelve apostles He entrusted these things.

They were "basketsful." They were inspired, and from them we have received all that was necessary to finish the great scheme of redemption. The "dogs," too, have eaten of the "fragments," for the Gentile world heard the message of salvation through these twelve apostles.

"*And she said, Truth, Lord; yet the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their masters' table.*" Chrysostom, one of the most learned and the most eloquent of the Greek fathers, says that the "master" spoken of here is the Jews. I am very glad indeed that this great orator made a sad mistake; for if he spoke the truth here, we should all be excluded from the kingdom of heaven. The Jews kept no dogs, and consequently they could eat no crumbs from a Jewish table. The last thing in the world that the Jews were willing to admit was, that the Gentiles should be admitted into God's family. The children here are the ancient Jews; the Master of the table is God Himself. When Christ speaks of the dogs as having a master, He at once admits the Gentiles into the household of God, even in the low, subordinate position of dogs, waiting for their supply when the children are filled. Another person would have been angry to have been compared to a dog, but this woman at once takes hold of the possibility of her favor being granted, and, appealing to our Lord, accepts the situation as it is: "Call me a dog, if Thou wilt; I know that the time will come when the Gentiles shall be favored from the Master's table; but in the meantime my daughter will die. Grant me but one crumb now. Save my daughter!"

Here I observe a point worthy of our study: God's dealings with the Gentiles. The Canaanites were first condemned to utter destruction. They were compared to useless stones, which only cumbered the Master's vineyard, and are to be gathered out of it and destroyed, like wild beasts of the forest.

Now they are compared to dogs belonging to the master's household, but not to his family, feeding on the crumbs that fall from his table; and in the parable of the prodigal son, I understand that the "hired servants having enough and to spare," are Gentile proselytes; while Paul speaks of them as children of Abraham by faith, and sons of God through the gospel.

"*Then Jesus answered and said unto her, O woman, great is thy faith; be it unto thee even as thou wilt. And her daughter was made whole from that very hour.*" Mark adds: "And when she was come to her house, she found the devil gone out, and her daughter laid upon the bed." Her faith had accomplished the work. Her request was granted. Her daughter was cured of her malady, and, as I understand, was enjoying a calm, quiet sleep, to which she had been a stranger, it may be, for years.

Trench, on the Miracles, compares this woman, earnestly begging, praying, striving, wrestling with our Lord, to Jacob's night struggle at Peniel with the angel of the covenant. In that case it was the Angel of the Covenant that Jacob wrestled with, and in this case it is Jesus, the eternal Word, that this woman cried to. Jacob would not let the angel go until he had received a blessing, and this woman

would not let the Savior alone until He had granted her request. And both received a blessing on account of their faith.

But there is a dim halo beyond this, which Trench has not seen, or if he has, has not mentioned, perhaps not being able to grasp the whole in his limited vision. Jacob was the representative of the family of Israel, and it was not alone upon himself, but upon his family, that this blessing was to fall. Now, in a later age, that family has forfeited the blessing, and it is about to depart from them, and fall, like Elijah's mantle, upon the Gentile world. This woman is a representative of the pagan Gentile world, and her daughter is the children of this world, possessed with a devil. The Angel of the Covenant, now the living Word, grants a blessing, and the Gentiles are made heirs of the promises of Abraham, they sit at the feet of Jesus, clothed and in their right minds.

But where are the children of the kingdom now? Many shall come from the east, and from the west, and shall sit down with Abraham and with Isaac and with Jacob, and the children of the kingdom shall be cast out. The last book of this sacred Bible says, "Without are dogs." But before leaving this miracle I would suggest the examination of an important point, and one which is causing much discussion in the Church at the present time. This daughter had probably never heard of Jesus. In all probability the mother had become acquainted with the character and mission of the great Miracle Worker after her daughter had become possessed

with a devil. I repeat, then, that, possessed with a devil, the daughter could learn nothing of Christ. Christ did not visit her. The gospel was not preached to her; she never saw the Savior; probably never heard of Him; and yet, in utter ignorance of Christ, *she was saved by Him from the power of Satan.* This I believe to be the direct, undeviating account as given by the inspired evangelist. If I am wrong, I would thank any man who would put me right. If I am right, and any man's creed is not in conformity with this, it is no fault of mine. If language expressing the reverse of this may be made so flexible as to conform with it, I shall not object. I would merely suggest that the creed speaks to us in language as clear and plain as the account of this miracle recorded by the evangelist is given in the plain English of King James' Bible. Again, this girl was not healed on account of her own faith, but on account of the faith of her mother.

THE LUNATIC CHILD.

"And when He came to His disciples, He saw a great multitude about them, and the scribes questioning with them. And straightway all the people, when they beheld Him, were greatly amazed, and running to Him saluted Him. And He asked the scribes, What question ye with them? And one of the multitude answered and said, Master, I have brought unto Thee my son, which hath a dumb spirit; and wheresoever he taketh him, he teareth him; and he foameth, and gnasheth with his teeth, and pineth away; and I spake to Thy disciples that they should cast him out; and they could not. He answereth him, and

saith, O faithless generation, how long shall I be with you? how long shall I suffer you? bring him unto Me. And they brought him unto Him: and when He saw him, straightway the spirit tare him; and he fell on the ground, and wallowed foaming. And He asked his father, How long is it ago since this came unto him? And he said, Of a child. And ofttimes it hath cast him into the fire, and into the waters, to destroy him; but if Thou canst do anything have compassion on us, and help us. Jesus said unto him, If thou canst believe, all things are possible to him that believeth. And straightway the father of the child cried out, and said with tears, Lord, I believe; help Thou mine unbelief. When Jesus saw that the people came running together, He rebuked the foul spirit, saying unto him, Thou dumb and deaf spirit, I charge thee, come out of him, and enter no more into him. And the spirit cried, and rent him sore, and came out of him: and he was as one dead; insomuch that many said, He is dead. But Jesus took him by the hand, and lifted him up; and he arose. And when He was come into the house, His disciples asked Him privately, Why could not we cast him out? And He said unto them, This kind can come forth by nothing, but by prayer and fasting."—MARK ix. 14–29.

I HAVE tried to make myself acquainted with the latest and best information I can upon the subject, and then improve upon this as far as my own limited knowledge of the Scriptures will allow me to do so. But after all, I feel that there is a depth of meaning, a world of significance in the language used, which is beyond my power to fathom. Especially so have I felt this to be the case with the miracle before us. As I examine different authors upon the separate points of this miracle, I feel that they are unsatisfactory to my own mind, and do not bring out the truths intended to be conveyed by our Lord in His teachings; and yet I feel that my own knowledge is too limited, my mind too weak to grasp the

whole lesson, and present it to my readers in all its beauty.

"*And when He came to His disciples, He saw a great multitude about them, and the scribes questioning with them. And straightway all the people, when they beheld Him, were greatly amazed, and running to Him saluted Him.*" The event here recorded occurred immediately after our Lord's descent from the Mount of Transfiguration. And oh, what a contrast we find between the two scenes! In the Mount of Transfiguration He was in the very presence of heaven for a few moments resting on earth. Whether the persons who there presented themselves to Him were really Moses and Elias, or their sublime antitypes,—the presence of the Holy Spirit overshadowing Him and the favored disciples, like a shining cloud, or the sublimity of the mountain scenery around them, the quiet tranquillity which reigned there gave it a foretaste of heaven and its future glories.

But He has now come down to the valley of humiliation. He finds a great multitude collected, and the scribes questioning or disputing, doubtless quarreling with His disciples; an afflicted father grieving over the torment which his son is enduring, and the son racked and torn by an unclean spirit, while His own disciples are engaged in a silly dispute among themselves as to who should be greatest in the kingdom of heaven. A similar account of this occurs in the Old Testament, when Moses descended from the presence of God in Mount Sinai, and beheld the children of Israel engaged in a pagan dance

around a golden idol which their own hands had made during his absence.

The missionary,—and alas! I fear too often, the minister,—feels this sad change as he comes down from his pulpit on the Lord's day, and enters upon the duties of the week. From holy communion with God in the mountain of the law, or in the Mount of Transfiguration, he goes through his flock, and finds them engaged in hot disputes, bickerings, backbitings, calumnies; some in affliction and trouble and pain, while others are grievously tormented with an unclean spirit, want of faith showing itself every where.

"*The people when they beheld Him were greatly amazed.*" Why were they "greatly amazed?" The usual answer to this question is, that when Jesus came down from the Mount of Transfiguration that His countenance shone as Moses' face did when he came down out of Mount Sinai. This hardly appears to me to be a satisfactory answer. I know of no intimation in the record that His face did shine. The apostle Paul speaks of "the glory of God being revealed in the face of Jesus;" but how?—when?—where? A reason which has arisen in my own mind appears to me more satisfactory than this. Supposing that the scribes were highly elated, thinking that they had gained a triumph over Jesus, in that He had promised His disciples "when He called them to give them power over unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal all manner of sickness, and all manner of disease"—"to cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils," etc. (Matt. x. 1–8);

and now they find His disciples alone, they seize this opportunity of proving them as to whether this promise had been fulfilled or not. Bringing this sad case to the disciples, they learn that they can do nothing, and at once they arrive at the conclusion that the promises of Jesus to His disciples were false, and that He had deceived them, and was nothing more than an imposter. In vain the disciples plead that they had cast out many devils (Mark vi. 12, 13), and had anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them. They answered, It is useless to tell us what you have done. Here is an unclean spirit in this man before us now, cast him out, if you can. As long as you cannot cast this unclean spirit out, we must consider your assumption as but proof that you are all a pack of impostors; and such being the case, we must consider your Master an impostor also. Taking advantage of Christ's absence, they had really perverted the minds of His disciples, and turned them against their Lord. And they were now telling the multitude that Christ had abandoned His disciples, and would never appear among them again; that He dare not, as they had fully exposed His imposition. As a natural consequence, "all the people were greatly amazed" when Christ appears in their midst, believing that He had power to perform the miracle, although His disciples possessed not this power.

Calvin thought that the scribes were triumphant, arguing that the inability of the disciples to cast out the unclean spirit proved the inability of their Master; and I think that this reason is satisfactory,

while at the same time it affords us food for future study.

"*And He asked the scribes, What question ye with them?*" What are the questions with which you trouble My disciples? If you have any questions to ask, ask Me, and trouble not My disciples. They are silent. Not a scribe opens his mouth. Finally, the father of the afflicted son relates what has occurred as far as he himself is concerned.

All this corresponds so perfectly well with my own personal experience as a missionary in Mexico that I can feel that it was a master-hand that penned these lines. During my whole stay in Mexico, no priest or advocate of the Romish church would ever engage in conversation with myself, but the moment my back was turned they would endeavor to entice away our converts. On one occasion, which I distinctly remember, being worn down with steady work, I went for ten days, in the heat of the summer, to rest in the mountains. I was no sooner gone than they circulated a report that I had become convinced of my errors, and had gone to the United States, never to return. And oh! how active our enemies were in taking advantage of every such occasion to circulate their malicious insinuations and slanders; but when confronted with the truth, not a word would they utter, until another occasion gave them opportunity to repeat their calumnies, which they were most certain to do.

"*And one of the multitude answered and said, Master, I have brought unto Thee my son, which hath a dumb spirit; and wheresoever he taketh him*

he teareth him; and he foameth and gnasheth with his teeth, and pineth away; and I spake to Thy disciples that they should cast him out; and they could not." I shall not dwell upon this subject. I have nothing new to tell you about those possessed with devils. The case before us appears to be somewhat similar to epilepsy.

"*He answereth him, and saith, O faithless generation, how long shall I be with you? how long shall I suffer you? bring him unto Me.*" "O faithless generation" I think is addressed to the whole multitude, and not to the disciples alone, as some suppose.

"*And they brought him unto Him: and when He saw him, straightway the spirit tare him; and he fell on the ground, and wallowed foaming. And He asked his father, How long is it ago since this came unto him? And he said, Of a child. And ofttimes it hath cast him into the fire, and into the waters, to destroy him: but if Thou canst do any thing, have compassion on us, and help us. Jesus said unto him, If thou canst believe, all things are possible to him that believeth. And straightway the father of the child cried out, and said with tears, Lord, I believe; help Thou mine unbelief.*" Christ does not cure the case immediately, but engages the father in conversation about his son. You notice that the father says, "*Have compassion on us, and help us.*" The life of his child was so bound up with his own life that any help granted the son was to the father also. The language of this father is similar to that of the Syrophenician woman in behalf of her daughter, "Lord, have mercy on me." It

does not appear to be so much a want of faith upon the part of the father as being misguided by the malicious scribes. "Lord, I believe; help Thou mine unbelief" appears to come from a sincere heart. He went to the servants, not to the Master. Men too often expect help from the minister. Go to Christ; He is the divine essence of all love, wisdom and power. "Come unto Me" is His invitation. The Romish doctrine of having a priest—a human intercessor—between ourselves and God, will not do. We cannot believe through others, however much confidence we may have in their religion. In a teachable spirit we go to Him; in humility we kneel down and tell Him our needs; a feeling of peace and of nearness to Him comes to us, and we feel encouraged; thus is a spirit of faith formed within us, and we receive in a willing manner and test by loving practice the truths He has taught us. Faith cannot come to us till the Lord is fully realized in our hearts.

"*When Jesus saw that the people came running together, He rebuked the foul spirit, saying unto him, Thou dumb and deaf spirit, I charge thee, come out of him, and enter no more into him. And the spirit cried, and rent him sore, and came out of him: and he was as one dead; insomuch that many said, He is dead. But Jesus took him by the hand, and lifted him up; and he arose.*" "I charge thee that thou come out of him." None but God has this power over the spirits of the unseen world. "I charge thee" was never spoken to any unclean spirit by Peter, James or John. With them it was ever "in

the *name* of *Jesus*" that unclean spirits were cast out. Their authority was only delegated authority, while His was the original—Divine. "The spirit rent him sore." This is the last opportunity he will ever have, and he is determined to make the most of it. As some one remarks, he is "like the outgoing tenant, who cares not what mischief he does."

Oh! how many unclean spirits of this sort there are, who, like Satan, are filled with great rage, knowing that their time is short.

"*And when He was come into the house, His disciples asked Him privately, Why could not we cast him out? And He said unto them, This kind can come forth by nothing but by fasting and prayer.*" Matthew says: "Jesus said unto them, Because of your unbelief; for verily I say unto you, if ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place, and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible unto you. Howbeit, this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting."

When I first went to Mexico, one of the early converts, fixing on a literal interpretation of these words, was endeavoring to do an extraordinary amount of fasting and prayer, supposing that some supernatural power would be granted to him. If living, I presume he is fasting yet, unless he has gone over to the scribes and Pharisees, and concluded that Christ was an impostor. Upon this passage of Scripture I have found nothing to my mind that is satisfactory. The great difficulty, not only with the disciples, but with the whole of this

multitude, was, that they looked upon these miracles very much as we would upon the tricks of a conjurer. They did not appear to know that in heaven and earth there was but one power that could perform them—Christ alone, the Lord of all, except as He chose to delegate this power to others. Until He chose to delegate this power to them by an extraordinary effusion of His Spirit, they could perform no miracles. The time had not come when Christ's promises to His disciples would be fulfilled. A teacher of Latin may promise his scholars that they shall deliver a Latin oration to the whole college, but their inability to do so while studying the Latin grammar is no proof that he is an impostor. When the disciples knew what the kingdom of heaven was, and possessed an unbounded faith in a risen Lord, then this power was delegated to them. To-day this power is spiritual, and exercised over Satan's spiritual kingdom.

But it is especially recorded, that when He sent them out He gave them power over unclean spirits. This is true; and I think the whole difficulty lies just here, that He gave them this power only while on this mission, and when the mission ceased the power ended. Suppose Mr. M——— should commission me to go to a certain city, and buy goods for him; it would be understood that whatever bills I signed on that journey, he would honor by prompt payment; but if I contracted a bill six months afterwards, he would not pay it, as it was not included in the commission. And just so in the case of the disciples. A want of faith, with increased prayer and

fasting, must not be taken literally. They had faith enough—in fact, they had too much faith, or they would not have undertaken to cast out this unclean spirit. But their faith was not of the right kind. Their faith was that of the Mexican I spoke of—faith in their own ability. The prayer and fasting is not to be of body, but of spirit. In the transfiguration a foretaste of the spiritual kingdom is presented. The next commission the apostles receive to cast out unclean spirits will be under the auspices of that kingdom. Prayer and fasting, then, means humility, depreciation of self, magnifying the power and glory of Christ. "In My name shall they cast out devils." While they are in hot dispute as to which should be greatest in the kingdom of heaven, they have no power to cast out devils.

THE STATER IN THE FISH'S MOUTH.

"And when they were come to Capernaum, they that received tribute money came to Peter, and said, Doth not your master pay tribute? He saith, Yes. And when he was come into the house, Jesus prevented him, saying, What thinkest thou, Simon? of whom do the kings of the earth take custom or tribute? of their own children, or of strangers? Peter saith unto Him, Of strangers. Jesus saith unto him, Then are the children free. Notwithstanding, lest we should offend them, go thou to the sea, and cast an hook, and take up the fish that first cometh up; and when thou hast opened his mouth, thou shalt find a piece of money: that take, and give unto them for Me and thee."—MATT. xvii. 24–27.

A GREAT deal of discussion was entertained in early times in regard to this miracle, as to whether the tribute money here spoken of was the tax col-

lected by the Roman government, or a tax to support the temple service; in other words, was it a civil, or was it a religious tax? Pretty much all modern commentators are so thoroughly agreed that this was a religious tax, and the whole language as well as the force and design of the parable teach that it was for the expenses of the temple-service, that it would hardly be worth our time to discuss the merits of this question. In passing through it I may merely point out some of the most prominent proofs.

"*And when they were come to Capernaum, they that received tribute money came to Peter and said, Doth not your Master pay tribute?*" The manner in which the question is asked—"Doth not your Master pay tribute?"—would indicate that this was not a compulsory tax, but rather a free-will offering. And then, it could not be the Roman tax, as that was compulsory, and thus it would not be presented as a tax they might pay or not, as they chose, but a tax that they must pay.

This tax is referred to in various parts of the Old Testament. In Moses we read, "This they shall give, every one that passeth among them that are numbered, (that is, twenty years old,) half a shekel after the shekel of the sanctuary; a half shekel shall be the offering to the Lord." This was called the atonement money, and was used to defray the expenses of the tabernacle, and later of the temple. In the time of the kings we read of this tax being collected and applied to the repairing of the temple. "And the king called for Jehoiada, the chief, and

said unto him, Why hast thou not required of the Levites to bring in out of Judah and out of Jerusalem the collection, according to the commandment of Moses, the servant of the Lord, and of the congregation of Israel, for the tabernacle to witness?" "And they made a proclamation through Judah and Jerusalem, to bring unto the Lord the collection that Moses, the servant of God, laid upon Israel in the wilderness." This tax was the same amount that Peter paid, that is, a stater or shekel, for himself and Lord, the tax of two persons, according to the law of Moses. It appears that this tribute was paid yearly by devout Jews everywhere, and sent up to Jerusalem by those Jews who were living in the remotest parts of the Roman empire. After the destruction of the temple, this tax was still collected, as far as possible, by the Romans, and sent to Rome, probably to defray the expenses of a pagan religion.

"*He saith, Yes. And when he was come into the house, Jesus prevented him, saying, What thinkest thou, Simon? of whom do the kings of the earth take custom or tribute? of their own children, or of strangers?*" Had this been the Roman tribute, it would have been the publicans that would have collected it, and Peter would undoubtedly have hesitated in answering such a question so promptly. But when the question was asked, Peter, not thinking that his Lord was the King of Israel, but that He was a true Jew, who lived according to the law of Moses, who had before told them that He had not come to do away with the law, but who at His baptism had told them that He must "fulfil all

righteousness," unhesitatingly responded "yes," thus compromising himself and his Lord. Peter, as was too often the case, was altogether too headstrong, too hasty, always ready to form his conclusions by a superficial view, and never thought of diving down into the very depths of a subject to examine it in all its aspects. He thought that his Lord's piety would compel Him to pay the tax to support the temple service. Why, in his mind, there could be no doubt about it. Alas! how many theologians and churches, —I am sorry to say, yet it is too true, whole sects— base their doctrines and proofs upon views as superficial as those of Peter in this case. Examine the Scriptures that you may know whether these things be so or not.

"*Jesus prevented him.*" "He saith, Yes. And when he was come into the house, Jesus prevented him, saying, What thinkest thou, Simon? of whom do the kings of the earth take custom or tribute? of their own children, or of strangers?" The word "prevent" here means "to anticipate." Jesus, knowing Peter's thoughts, knew all that had transpired, and how Peter had compromised Him in the payment of the temple tax. Before Peter had had an opportunity to tell Him the circumstance, He asks Peter the question, "Of whom?" "Peter saith unto Him, Of strangers. Jesus saith unto him, Then are the children free." Peter had just before this confessed that Christ was the Son of the living God, of that God to whom the temple belonged, and for whom the whole temple service was performed. If, therefore, the kings of the earth ex-

empt their own children from paying taxes, how much more then should the King of the temple exempt His own Son?

Undoubtedly Peter sees the force of the question at once. The children of the King must be free. If Christ is a Son of David, He must then be free from this tax, and much more so if He be the Son of God. Here, again, we have another proof that this was not a civil tax, to be paid to the Roman Emperor. Christ was in no sense a son of Cæsar, and while in Cæsar's dominions could in no way be free from paying Cæsar's taxes. "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's," was a law which He, as a man, was in duty bound to respect, as much as any other citizen of Judea. I notice on this point, that Trench and others confine the sonship to Christ alone. Trench says: "The explanation, namely, that He (Christ) intends to extend the liberty to His people, to all that in this secondary sense are the sons of God, cannot be admitted, for it is not the fact concerning dues owing to God." Here I think that we may discern the same hasty conclusions which Peter had formed concerning the payment of the tribute money by his Master. I believe that Christ here intended to include all regenerated believers. *First*, If Christ had intended that Peter should understand that He alone was exempt from the payment of this tribute money, He would have asked, "Of whom does a king exact tribute? of his own son, or of strangers?" *Second*, The word "strangers" here does not typify those who are outside of the family of God—that is, the pagan and Gentile world

—but the house of Israel while in servitude to the law. Soon the gospel will make them free, and then they will be under no obligation to longer support the temple service. I know that I shall be answered here, that the Christian Church will then supersede the temple service, and that they will still be under obligations to pay tribute to support the church, as they had been to support the temple. But I answer, that there is a still deeper point to take into consideration, which manifests itself in the next verse.

"*Notwithstanding, lest we should offend them, go thou to the sea, and cast an hook, and take up the fish that first cometh up; and when thou hast opened his mouth, thou shalt find a piece of money: that take, and give unto them for Me and thee.*" "Lest we offend them,' we will pay this tribute money. Peter, still being a servant with Moses, was under obligations to pay the temple tribute; but Christ, being Lord of the temple, was not. But Christ, in the position He then occupied, was not yet Lord of the temple. His position was that of a gospel minister, an office upon which Peter would soon enter; and not only was He a representative of the gospel ministry to be instituted in the Christian Church after the descent of the Holy Ghost, but He was also a representative of the regenerated Church. Now all in the Christian Church who may be said to be still disciples of Moses, are under obligations to pay their tribute to the Church, for these, above all others, are the recipients of all favors, while they contribute none, and can contribute none, unless it be in this way; that is, by their yearly or monthly

dues to the Church, whatever these may be. But, on the other hand, the regenerated priesthood of the Church are all supposed to be engaged in some active service for the Church. One is a minister, another an elder, who should assist the minister in his labors within the Church, attend to the prayer-meetings, teaching, and any work he can find to do within the Church. Another is a deacon, whose work is outside of the Church, to visit the poor, the sick, to bring in, while others are engaged as teachers. Properly speaking, those laboring for the Church might be considered exempt. Yet Christ here, as their representative, who, by healing of leprosy and palsy and other kindred diseases, was sending to the temple people who would not otherwise enter it, was indirectly contributing to the temple service; yet as these short-sighted people could not see this, for fear of giving them offense, He sets us an example by paying the temple tribute—just what every regenerated believer should do over and above all the personal labor he can perform in other ways for the benefit of the Church. And yet our Savior carries out the distinction to the end of the chapter—"Pay for Me and for thee." He does not say, "Pay for us," for that would be putting the servant and the Son in the same category. "I ascend unto My Father and your Father; to My God and your God."

"*Notwithstanding, lest we should offend them, go thou to the sea, and cast an hook, and take up the fish that first cometh up; and when thou hast opened his mouth, thou shalt find a piece of money; that take, and give unto them for Me and thee.*" Now observe

the way in which this money was obtained. He sends Peter back to his old occupation. He must go a fishing. And how else can the temple of Christ be built up? Keep in mind that the sea is the pagan world, and the fish are those who are to be converted from it. Convert a drunkard, and he becomes laborious. Convert your idle, indigent neighbor, and he becomes industrious. And if your neighbor becomes thrifty and industrious, that will put money in your pocket wherewith you can pay the tribute money. The fish will bring you the money in his own mouth. I wish I could impress this lesson on the mind of every one who reads these words. The religion of Jesus Christ is intended to make every man prosperous here in this life, and would most certainly do so if people would only put it into practice.

RAISING OF LAZARUS.

"When Jesus heard that, He said, This sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God, that the Son of God might be glorified thereby."—JOHN xi. 4.

AT the house of a small family in Bethany, a little village but a short distance from Jerusalem, our Lord, while occupied in His earthly ministry, was accustomed to visit. One motive may have been its nearness to Jerusalem, where He could spend the night after having occupied the day in teaching in the temple and streets of Jerusalem. Another may have been the still quiet of a little village, away

from the noise and bustle of the great city, rendering it a very appropriate place to rest both mind and body.

It has been a disputed question among theologians why the first three evangelists have made no record of this miracle—one of the most important miracles that Christ performed—while John alone records it.

Without entering into the merits of this question, I will only observe, that the first three evangelists say very little about the miracles wrought in and near Jerusalem. John appears to confine himself more directly to these, while the other evangelists are more particular in regard to those wrought in Galilee. This is in accordance with John's position, being the most spiritual of all the evangelists, and records that which comes more directly under his own grade in the spiritual ladder dreamed of by father Jacob.

"*When Jesus heard that, He said, This sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God, that the Son of God might be glorified thereby. Now Jesus loved Martha, and her sister, and Lazarus. When He had heard therefore that he was sick, He abode two days still in the same place where He was.*" Lazarus was sick. The sisters dispatch a messenger to Jesus. He is at a distance, perhaps at Bethabara, beyond the Jordan. The sisters have the utmost confidence in Jesus, believing that He can restore their brother to health. The messenger has gone, and they begin to reason with each other, Will He come? The Jews had lately attempted to stone Him. If He comes, they will put Him to death. But will He

not give the word. We have seen that in other cases He but gave the command, and the disease left the sick person. Will He speak the word now? or will He come? Is He afraid that the Jews will kill Him.

But the brother grows worse and worse, and finally dies. What does this mean? Will He not even speak the word to save him that He had professed to love so well? He allows him to die. But perhaps the messenger has not been able to find Him. And now the messenger returns alone. How is this? We can imagine the questions that the two sisters put to the messenger on his return. Did you find Him? Why did He not come? Why did He not speak the word? And the messenger relates the words that Jesus spoke: "This sickness is not unto death." How can it be possible? Why, he is dead already. Can it be possible that Jesus has been deceived? Why, he has already been two days in the tomb.

And then remember that the two sisters were surrounded by unbelieving Jews, who had lately sought to stone Jesus, imagining Him to be an impostor. And now is the hour of their triumph. They would say, "How often have we told you that He was an impostor; and now you see that we were right. He says that 'this sickness is not unto death,' and behold, he is already dead and buried. Do not trouble yourself about Him. He will never dare show His face in the vicinity of Jerusalem again." Oh! if any one ever had reason to have their faith in Jesus of Nazareth shaken, these two sisters cer-

tainly did. And yet there is something in the words of Jesus which the messenger brought which dispels the idea that He is an impostor: "This sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God, that the Son of God might be glorified thereby." Could we but understand it, no sickness of the body is unto death. It is but the tearing away of this ragged, tattered garment of clay, to be clothed in life eternal, that the Son of God may be glorified in us.

"In an open space between the Esquiline and Palatine hills are to be seen the ruins of the Colosseum, or Flavian amphitheatre. This gigantic edifice, the boast of Rome and of the world, which was begun by Vespasian, and completed by Titus, is in form an ellipse, and covers an area of about five and a half acres. The external elevation consisted of four stories; each of the three lower stories having eighty arches, supported by half-columns. * * * The walls of the fourth story were faced with Corinthian pilasters, and lighted by forty rectangular windows. The space surrounding the central arena within the walls was occupied with sloping galleries, rising one above another, resting on a huge mass of arches; and ascending towards the summit of the external wall, one hundred and sixty staircases led to the galleries, and an immense moveable awning covered the whole. * * * Within the area of the Colosseum, gladiators, martyrs, slaves, and wild beasts combated during the Roman festivals; and here the blood of both men and animals flowed in torrents to furnish amusement to the degenerated Romans."

Let us go back eighteen hundred years, and stand

in that great amphitheatre in Rome. Thousands are gathered there in those immense tiers of seats that run around the mammoth building. Yonder, in purple robes and crowns of gold, sit the Cæsars and the members of the royal family. Near by are the officers of the court, and many a general, covered with scars received on foreign battlefields. Youth and beauty, as well as hoary old age, are gathered there. Here a seat is occupied by young men and women, engaged in happy, joyous conversation, and there another by an entire family—father, mother and children—all anxiously awaiting an interesting spectacle. It is a gala day, and all appear to be happy. A band strikes up a tune unknown in our day. You may call it "The Fall of Jerusalem," or "The Coronation of Titus," if you please. Suddenly the band stops, and all is still. The expected hour has arrived. A door opens in the side of the immense pit, and a captive—a young girl—is led forth into the middle of the pit. She kneels, raises her chained hands, and folds them across her breast, raises her eyes to heaven, and distinctly repeats, "Our Father, which * * * Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven." But another door has been opened in the pit, and an immense lion springs upon his prey. A scream, a struggle, and our Father's will has been done. This pain, this struggle, is not unto death, but unto life. "If a grain of corn fall not into the earth and die, it remaineth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." The grain of corn planted in Rome's great Colosseum flourishes in immortal youth in a world

from which all savage beasts and beastly Neros are excluded for ever. Nor is this all. The grain of corn has borne a whole sheaf of rich, golden grain. The heroic act which induced this young disciple of Christ to cling so stubbornly to the religion of Him who had redeemed her soul as to yield up her mortal life a laughing-stock and spectacle of derision to the great multitude, and suffer a painful death rather than deny Him, had its influence on a score of others, who that day, by beholding her example, were born anew—born into Christ's kingdom. "The ashes of the martyrs are the seed of the Church." By the suffering of this martyr the glory of God was revealed to others.

"*When Jesus heard that, He said, This sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God, that the Son of God might be glorified thereby.*" Oh! this sickness, this pain we suffer here, is not unto death! Others seeing our fortitude, our confidence in Christ, as we pass through the dark waters, will be induced to abandon all hope of navigating their way through the grave alone and in their own strength, and will accept the guidance of the only Pilot who knows the way, and so our Lord will be glorified thereby.

"*Now Jesus loved Martha, and her sister, and Lazarus. When He had heard, therefore, that he was sick, He abode two days still in the same place where He was.*" It appears strange that, if Christ loved Martha and Mary and Lazarus, He should still remain in the same place until Lazarus was dead. But when we examine the matter in its proper light, a most important truth is taught us

here. The Jews were expecting a Savior who would save them from earthly enemies by the power of the sword, as Joshua had done, and who would confer upon them wonderful blessings, as Moses had done, in this life. With the exception of a few typical miracles to strengthen our confidence in Him, Christ's greatest blessings come to us through the grave. Oh! why does He tarry?

That dear child is at the point of death—suffering, groaning, dying! Hour after hour passes, and there is no change but for the worse. Why does He tarry? It is not here, it is not here, that the blessing comes. It is the other side of the grave. That martyr, consigned to death! he is chained to the stake; the faggots are piled up around him; the torch is applied; the ribald throng shout, and curse, and mock, and blaspheme; the flame arises, scorching, stifling, blinding! Oh! why does He not come to avenge His own elect? Not here; not now. We must first glorify God by suffering for Him, and then He will glorify us by raising us to immortal life.

"*Then after that saith He to His disciples, Let us go into Judea again. His disciples say unto Him, Master, the Jews of late sought to stone Thee, and goest Thou thither again? Jesus answered, Are there not twelve hours in the day? If any man walk in the day, he stumbleth not, because he seeth the light of this world. But if a man walk in the night, he stumbleth, because there is no light in him.*" Christ speaks of His own mission here as a day of twelve hours. While this day remaineth the prince of darkness could have no control over Him. His

enemies could not touch Him. He must go and fulfil His work. When His work was accomplished, then the night cometh; then He, like ourselves, like the martyrs, must be delivered over to the prince of the night to be crucified, put to death. "But if a man walk in the night, he stumbleth, because there is no light in him." A most important admonition. Whatever work the Father has given us to do, we must do now. If we neglect this work until night comes, we stumble. If we squander the day of life foolishly, we can make no amends in the grave. In the night we stumble and fall into the grave, and our opportunity to do the Lord's work is gone for ever. Satan's emissaries are around us,—suffering and sickness, disease, the allurements of the world,—and even Christ's disciples would advise us to put off the work; but the setting sun warns us that the day is closing.

In reviewing the former sermon, we see that Lazarus was sick. The sisters send a messenger to bring Jesus of Nazareth to him, to cure him; they wait and anxiously watch for His coming; their brother grows worse, and still the Savior does not come; he dies, is buried, and yet He has not come. There are unbelievers at hand who make use of this opportunity to try and shake their faith in Jesus. It is a trying moment to them. The messenger returns alone; they question him as to what Jesus said; he gives them His answer: "This sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God, that the Son of

God might be glorified thereby." They cannot understand His answer. "This sickness not unto death," when he is already dead and buried? Their minds are not in a state to grasp the true meaning of His words—to understand that life is but the result of death, even in the vegetable world, as a grain of corn being put in the earth to die and bring forth its fruits. The young Christian suffered death and passed away, but her example remained to give life to others, to raise up believers, and the Son of God was glorified thereby. "Now Jesus loved Martha, and her sister, and Lazarus." But he leaves them until Lazarus is dead, and an important truth is taught us from this, that we must first glorify God by suffering for Him—that the greatest blessing we receive, that of eternal life, comes to us through the grave.

"*Then after that saith He to His disciples, Let us go into Judea again. His disciples say unto Him, Master, the Jews of late sought to stone Thee, and goest Thou thither again? Jesus answered, Are there not twelve hours in the day? If any man walk in the day he stumbleth not, because he seeth the light of this world. But if a man walk in the night, he stumbleth, because there is no light in him.*" Christ refers here to His own mission. He must fulfil His work here,—His earthly mission. Ere long He too must be crucified—put to death. We also must work while it is yet day. Let not our lives pass with no effort to do the work put before us. Christ is our example, our guide; follow Him.

"*And I am glad for your sakes that I was not*

there, to the intent ye may believe; nevertheless, let us go unto him." The disciples misunderstood our Lord here. They supposed that He was talking of natural sleep, when He was speaking to them of death itself. These mistakes on the part of the disciples appear to have been quite common. They understood every thing in a material sense. When He said, "Destroy this temple," etc., they supposed that He spoke of the temple in Jerusalem, when He was talking to them about His own body. When He spake of the leaven of the Pharisees, they thought that He spake of the bread that they could not eat, because they had forgotten to take it. And yet, on the other hand, they appeared to misunderstand Him entirely when He spake about His death and resurrection. So many times we find Him telling them about His death and resurrection, and yet they did not know till after He was risen that He would rise again, leads me to suppose that they must have understood Him in an allegorical, and not in a literal, sense. In no other way can I comprehend how they could be so ignorant of such an important fact, when He was continually bringing it before them, as plainly and as distinctly as human language could express it.

"*Then said Jesus unto them plainly, Lazarus is dead. And I am glad for your sakes that I was not there, to the intent ye may believe; nevertheless, let us go unto him. Then said Thomas, which is called Didymus, unto his fellow disciples, Let us go, that we may die with him.*" Now He tells them plainly that Lazarus is dead. I have already spoken of the

trial of the faith of the two sisters. Jesus had not healed their brother, He had said that his sickness was not unto death; and yet he was already dead and buried. They were surrounded by unbelieving Jews, who had tried to stone Him. They had pronounced Him an imposter, and now the messenger had brought back word that He had said that this sickness was not unto death. They wanted no further testimony than this. And now the disciples begin to reason together. They would say, "Have we not already warned Him not to go there?" "Did we not tell Him how the Jews sought to stone Him when He was there before?" "And now the messenger has already returned, and told them that Lazarus' sickness was not unto death, and yet he is already dead." "Will they not certainly stone Him for an impostor now? And if we go with Him they will stone us also." "Then said Thomas, which is called Didymus, unto his fellow disciples, Let us also go, that we may die with him." Was this faith in Thomas such as would lead him to follow his Master while the day lasted, and then take the consequences of resting under the lock and key of him who has the power of death? Or was it a melancholy don't-care-what-becomes of-me-now disposition, that would induce him to throw away his life, just as some Mexican revolutionist would follow his chief either in victory or death, feeling that, if he could not gain the former, the latter was preferable to a life of shame and disgrace. Chrysostom thinks that Thomas was weak and timid, and would hardly dare follow his Master up to Jerusalem; and yet after he

had become thoroughly imbued with the spirit of his Master, he shrank at no danger in proclaiming his risen Lord, braved every danger for the sake of the gospel, and did not even stop until he had carried the gospel away into India.

"*Then when Jesus came, He found that he had lain in the grave four days already. Now Bethany was nigh unto Jerusalem, about fifteen furlongs off. And many of the Jews came to Martha and Mary, to comfort them concerning their brother.*" We have already seen what sort of comforters the two sisters had. I have before referred to the custom of hiring persons to mourn at funerals. But a true Comforter is coming, one that need not be hired. "Then Martha, as soon as she heard that Jesus was coming, went and met Him; but Mary sat still in the house." Here is a mystery not easily solved. Christ remains without, as though He were afraid of the Jews that were collected there. And yet, by some means, Martha hears that He is coming, and she immediately goes out to meet Him, while Mary remains in the house. Here is something very strange. Martha had shown less affection for Jesus than Mary had, and yet had been more solicitous about His personal comforts. If the evangelist had told us that Mary went out to meet Him, and that Martha sat still in the house, it would appear much more natural. And yet to the spiritual observer, such is not the case. Martha represented the Jewish religion—a religion of ceremonies she was concerned about—and gave more attention to the temporal affairs of life, while Mary represented the Christian

religion, and her concern was for the spiritual. She loved to sit at the feet of Jesus and listen to His teachings.

"*Then said Martha unto Jesus, Lord, if Thou hadst been here, my brother had not died. But I know that even now, whatsoever Thou wilt ask of God, God will give it Thee. Jesus saith unto her, thy brother shall rise again. Martha saith unto Him, I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day.*" Martha's faith is not shaken at all. She believes Jesus to be a true prophet. She no doubt supposed that there might be some misunderstanding in the words of the messenger that she had sent; but yet she believed that Jesus had power to raise her brother, as others of the Jewish prophets had raised the dead. But she does not appear to understand that it is by His own inherent power that Christ should raise the dead. "But I know that even now whatsoever Thou wilt ask of God, God will give it Thee." But before Jesus answers this error into which she has fallen, He says, "Thy brother shall rise again." This is poor consolation. It was help here, and now, that she wanted. It was not when the fulness of the Gentiles should be brought in, stretching away down through twenty centuries, but now, and here, on the present occasion. Oh! my brethren, how we feel Martha's desire rising continually in our hearts day by day, and hour by hour. I do not know that you understand me. I will try to explain by illustration. A child at school may desire some passing enjoyment,—a toy it may be, or a holiday. His master refuses to grant

it. See how the child is disappointed. He cries; his heart is about to break; he will not be contented; he thinks that he is very badly treated—persecuted—and that his teacher is a very hard, cruel man. But his teacher knows that what he will learn in the eight hours of study he would have squandered in a holiday will in future years be of far more value than the holiday; and the child grown to manhood, as he looks back from after life, will be inclined to censure his teacher because he did not keep him still more closely to his books. It is a present enjoyment that Martha wants; and did she have her brother back again, she could enjoy his company but for a little time. He must die again. Let the Master's will be done. It is but a little while at most, and will soon pass.

"*Jesus said unto her, I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth in Me, though he were dead, yet shall he live.*" Christ is the resurrection. He is not only the resurrection, but He is the life. I think that this passage of Scripture proves clearly that none can give life to the dead but Christ; and if He had never come to our world, all men would perish like the brute, and never rise again. In fact, if Christ had not come, all the children of Adam would be annihilated at death. Christ says to the Pharisees, "If I had not come." Again, Christ is the resurrection of all. If He is not the resurrection of apostates, then apostates are not raised. Christ is the resurrection of the saved as well as the lost; but the lost are raised to shame and everlasting contempt.

"*He that believeth in Me, though he were dead, yet shall he live.*" Christ's words, "I am the resurrection," appear to me to be a positive declaration by our Lord, that a resurrection to damnation is not inherited from Adam. The germ of immortality, whether preserved unto a life of holiness or perverted unto a life of damnation, called eternal death, can have but one origin—Christ. He speaks of no other resurrection but that which is by Him. Nor have we any intimation whatever that there is any other. No account is taken here of the death of the body. This corresponds with what Christ had already said to the Jews, "Verily, verily I say unto you, He that believeth on Me hath everlasting life." "And whosoever liveth and believeth in Me shall never die. Believest thou this?"

This appears to me a positive refutation of John Miller's book, "The Soul Immortal." I looked in vain for this passage in his book, desiring to know how he would dispose of it. I can understand it in no other sense that that he who liveth and believeth in Christ has already immortality of soul; and although his body die, and return to dust, his soul can never die.

"*She saith unto Him, Yea, Lord, I believe that Thou art the Christ, the Son of God, which should come into the world.*" There was a belief among the Jews of that period that the Messiah when He should come would raise the dead; but how far they supposed His power over the dead would extend, I am unable to say. I suppose, however, that they thought that His power could at most be extended

upon those who had just died, and not upon persons who had been dead several days.

"*And when she had so said, she went her way, and called Mary her sister secretly, saying, The Master is come, and calleth for thee. And as soon as she heard that, she arose quickly, and came unto Him. Now Jesus was not yet come into the town, but was in that place where Martha met Him. The Jews then which were with her in the house, and comforted her, when they saw Mary, that she rose up hastily and went out, followed her, saying, She goeth unto the grave to weep there.*" Martha told her sister *secretly*, no doubt fearing, from the hatred which the Jews bore to Jesus, that they might do Him some harm. She does not wish them to know that He was there; but her precautions are useless; for not knowing why she went out, and at once guessing a reason, they all arose and followed her.

"*Then when Mary was come where Jesus was, and saw Him, she fell down at His feet, saying unto Him, Lord, if Thou hadst been here my brother had not died. When Jesus therefore saw her weeping, and the Jews also weeping which came with her, He groaned in the spirit and was troubled.*" Martha did not fall at the feet of Jesus, as Mary did. Martha appears to have recognized Him as a prophet. She says, "Whatsoever Thou shalt ask of God." But Mary recognizes Him as divine, and falls at His feet and worships Him. It was only after Martha had been closely questioned by Jesus that she recognizes Him as the Son of God; but Mary at once falls at His feet; it is the very first thing that she

does. The word translated "troubled" here should be "filled with indignation." And oh! did He not have reason to be filled with indignation? These hypocritical Jews would gladly stone Him who was the resurrection, and yet they mingle their hypocritical tears with those of the spiritual Mary. They can weep for Mary's brother, but have no tears for Mary's Lord. We almost wonder that divine wrath did not cause the earth to open, and swallow them up.

THE LAST MIRACLE.

"But when the morning was now come, Jesus stood on the shore; but the disciples knew not that it was Jesus.—JOHN xxi. 4.

THE last chapter of John's gospel appears like an appendix, or rather a postscript, added after the epistle was completed. Some have supposed that perhaps John did not write this chapter, but that some of the Ephesian church wrote it after his death. It is possible that John may have added this chapter to his epistle some time after he had written that; but there can be no doubt but the chapter is John's. There are a number of Greek words in the original of this chapter which John uses elsewhere, but appear nowhere else in the New Testament, besides several other words which appear to be peculiar to him, and are only occasionally used by the other writers.

"*After these things Jesus shewed Himself again*

to the disciples at the sea of Tiberias; and on this wise shewed He Himself." "Showed Himself." Do you notice anything peculiar in this expression? Perhaps we have here a clue to something important; let us follow it up. Luke, repeating the words of the disciples who had remained in Jerusalem after our Lord's crucifixion: "The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon." Luke, in the Acts, says: "He *was seen* many days of them that came up from Galilee." The original says, "He shewed Himself many days."(?) Paul uses the same language: "He was seen of Cephas;" "He was seen of above five hundred brethren at once;" "He was seen of James, and of all the apostles;" "He was seen of me also." In all of these passages the original is, He appeared, or manifested Himself. Now, this language is never used in regard to Jesus before His resurrection. "They see Him" is common enough, but that he appears to them, or manifests Himself to them, is only said of angels and of Jesus after His resurrection, indicating that when He appeared after His resurrection it was not in mortal flesh."

"*There were together Simon Peter, and Thomas, called Didymus, and Nathanael of Cana in Galilee, and the sons of Zebedee, and two other of His disciples. Simon Peter saith unto them, I go a fishing. They say unto him, We also go with thee. They went forth and entered into a ship immediately, and that night they caught nothing.*" Some have supposed that Peter, having lost confidence in our Lord, returned to his old trade. I hardly think this could be

the case, as Jesus had appeared to them before this, and now they all knew that He was risen. It is more than probable that, being short of means, Peter suggests to the disciples a trial of their old occupation in order to supply themselves with the necessaries of life.

We find in this second miraculous draught of fishes an intimate connection with the first, which occurred when Jesus called them to be disciples. Now He is about to send them out as apostles, we are not surprised to find the same lesson repeated, only with some very significant variations to suit the occasion. Then, as now, they toil all night, and catch nothing. I have often told you that the long night in the history of our world was that period when Israel was in bondage to the law. No converts were made from other nations, except a few proselytes who occasionally embraced Judaism, perhaps through mere personal interest. No progress had been made by the Jewish nation in spreading a knowledge of the true God of Israel among the heathen by which they were surrounded. So the night passed, and no fish were caught. No sheep were brought into the Redeemer's fold. None were added to Israel but those who were born of the literal seed of Jacob.

"*But when the morning was now come, Jesus stood on the shore; but the disciples knew not that it was Jesus.*" When this long night passes away, Jesus stands upon the shore, not now in mortal flesh, but in His glorified body. When the long tempestuous night of Judaism passes away, Jesus, in the

form of a Comforter, appears on the shore, but at first His disciples know Him not.

"*Then Jesus saith unto them, Children, have ye any meat? They answered Him, No. And He said unto them, Cast the net on the right side of the ship, and ye shall find. And they cast therefore, and now they were not able to draw it for the multitude of fishes.*" They cast in the net according to the command of Jesus, on the *right* side of the ship. In the former miracle of the same kind no distinction was made as to which side they were to cast the net, but here they are commanded to cast it on the right side. We can understand this at once, if we remember the difference which existed between the work of the disciples before and after the resurrection. How often have I told you that John in his ministry made no distinction of those he baptized? He baptized indiscriminately all who came to his baptism —good, bad, and indifferent. But now the circumstances are changed. Only the regenerated are to be received into a church composed of a spiritual priesthood, and consequently the order is here given that they should cast the net on the right side of the ship. I need not refer to all the places in the Scriptures where the right hand refers to that which is good, and the left to that which is bad or indifferent. Placing the sheep on His right hand, and the goats on His left, in the judgment, will be recalled to mind by all of you. Ezekiel lay on his right side for Judah, in which was that remnant of Israel which would be saved, but upon his left for the ten tribes which apostatized.

"And He said unto them, Cast the net on the right side of the ship, and ye shall find. They cast therefore, and now they were not able to draw it for the multitude of fishes. Therefore that disciple whom Jesus loved saith unto Peter, It is the Lord. Now when Simon Peter heard that it was the Lord, he girt his fisher's coat unto him, (for he was naked,) and did cast himself into the sea." John was the first to discover that the mysterious personage on the shore was the Lord. John was the most spiritual of all the disciples, and the most spiritual is always the first to discover the hand of the Lord in an event of this kind. Again, John probably recalled to mind the other miraculous draught of fishes, and its close resemblance to this, and at once saw that He who was the author of that, must also be the author of this.

The word translated "naked" here may mean no more than that he had thrown off his outer garment, in order that he might be more free to work. Critics find that the word is often used in that sense in Greek literature. We do not know what the garment was which is here translated a "fisherman's coat." The word literally means an "*overall*"—gospel armor.

"*And the other disciples came in a little ship; (for they were not far from land, but as it were two hundred cubits,) dragging the net with fishes. As soon then as they were come to land, they saw a fire of coals there, and fish laid thereon, and bread. Jesus saith unto them, Bring of the fish which ye have now caught. Simon Peter went up, and drew the net to*

land full of great fishes, an hundred and fifty and three; and for all there were so many, yet was not the net broken." How did that fire of coals come there? How did the fish come there which were on the coals? Where did the bread come from? Was this a miracle, or did Jesus obtain these things by natural process? It appears to me very much like a miracle. I believe that the fire and the fish and the bread were all made miraculously, and that the disciples partook of this miraculous fish and of this miraculous bread. I see no more difficulty in believing this than in believing that Jesus miraculously invested Himself with a miraculous body, into the open side of which Thomas could thrust his hand, and into whose wounded hands he could thrust his fingers, or that that miraculous body could eat natural bread, as He did in the presence of Abraham and Sarah, as well as in the presence of His own disciples.

"Simon Peter went up, and drew the net to land full of great fishes, an hundred and fifty and three; and for all there were so many, yet was not the net broken." None but *great* fishes enter the net of the new covenant. John the Baptist was a great prophet, but the very smallest child in the new covenant is greater than John. None but sanctified believers are found in this net.

One hundred and fifty-three was the number of the fishes. Twelve was a prominent number under the old covenant, and so was one hundred and forty-four. And I understand that the one hundred and forty-four thousand spoken of in Revelations, is the

typical number of those who should be saved under the old covenant. Perhaps this odd number, one hundred and fifty-three, is to designate the number which is to be saved under the new.

The net was not broken. On the occasion of the former draught of fishes, we are told that "the net brake." In commenting upon this passage in my sermon on that miracle, I followed the usual critics, that the net did not break, but was "about to break." I have examined all the versions I have at hand, and I find all the old versions say the *net brake.* Two new versions I have, one says that "the net was breaking," and the other "the net began to break." I think these translations have been influenced by the critics more than by the original. The original certainly says that the "net brake." The critics say that "if the net brake, the fish would get out." Why, this is just what the evangelist meant to say. The net did break, and some of the fish escaped; that is, under the old covenant, they fell from grace. But in this miracle, performed after the resurrection, we are distinctly told that the net did not break—that is, there is no falling from grace under the new covenant. Here we learn how errors creep into the translations of the Bible.

"Jesus saith unto them, Come and dine. And none of the disciples durst ask Him, Who art Thou? knowing that it was the Lord. Jesus then cometh, and taketh bread, and giveth them, and fish likewise. This is now the third time that Jesus shewed Himself to His disciples, after that He was risen from the dead." Why this meal? Christ, in His glorified

body, did not need it. The disciples were near their own homes. But the analogy which this bears to the spiritual must not be forgotten, or we lose sight of the great lesson which this miracle is intended to teach us.

During the night our bark is tossed on the stormy sea, but in the morning Jesus stands on the shore, ready to feed us with the bread of angels. Like the disciples, we bring of the fruits of our labors; and add them to the rejoicings of heaven.

They knew that it was the Lord, yet they dare not ask Him. Why did they wish to ask Him? "This is the Lord's doings, and it is marvellous in our eyes," is the language of His servants. We know by these miracles that it is the Lord, but we would know more of Him. And it is alone in eternity that a full knowledge of Him will be obtained; for is not His goodness, mercy and love as vast as eternity, as lasting as time?

"Jesus saith unto him, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? follow thou Me."—JOHN xxi. 22.

THE events evidently following the second miraculous draught of fishes, and recorded by John, have a most important connection with that miracle, and appear to grow directly out of the miracle itself.

Probably the most important lesson to be learned from this miracle was that the time had now come when the disciples were to go out into the world as fishermen of men, and in that capacity were to preach

the gospel to all nations; and that while engaged on this divine mission, they would be amply provided for; and that they must now abandon all love to the world, and devote themselves to the Lord's work, with an eye single to His glory, and a heart filled with love for the Savior of men.

"So when they had dined, Jesus saith to Simon Peter, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me more than these? He saith unto Him, Yea, Lord; Thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, Feed My lambs. He saith to him again, the second time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me? He saith unto Him, Yea, Lord; Thou knowest that I love Thee. He saith unto him, Feed My sheep. He saith unto him the third time, Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou Me? Peter was grieved because He said unto him the third time, Lovest thou Me? And he said unto Him, Lord, Thou knowest all things; Thou knowest that I love Thee. Jesus saith unto him, Feed My sheep." Our Lord's question to Peter doubtless had reference to the time when Peter had said, "Though all men be offended because of Thee, yet will I not be offended." Peter had said this in his own strength, and trusting in his own strength he fell. But his answer now is in quite a different spirit: "Yea, Lord; Thou knowest that I love Thee." Three times our Lord presented this question to the erring, but now repentant, disciple. This was the number of times that Peter had denied Him. Peter was now grieved, and appealed at once to His divinity: "Thou knowest all things." Thou knowest what is in my heart. Thou knowest all things.

Some have supposed that the commands, "Feed My lambs," "Feed My sheep," are but different forms of the same command, or in other words, but different ways of expressing the same thing. I do not understand the Scriptures in this way. There is nothing superfluous in the Scriptures. Every expression has its own legitimate object. "Feed the lambs" I consider to refer to the young, the weak, the tender lambs in the faith; those who, in the Christian dispensation, are the antitypes of the Jewish fold, whose proper sphere to-day is in the Sabbath-school. "The sheep" to which our Lord refers are those who are stronger, older in the faith—the regenerated spiritual priesthood. Both require spiritual food, and this is the gospel minister's occupation —to see that both are fed. He is not to confine himself to either one class or the other, but he is to give to all their meat in due season.

I think that there were probably two objects in telling Peter to feed His flock. *First*, By so doing our Lord assures Peter that the past is all forgiven. He is now restored to his former position; and more than this, he is now to be one of the apostles to go forth and carry spiritual food to all the nations of the earth. *Second*, The other object is to give him to understand that it is not an open profession of love that He now requires. An open profession of love before might have been of some value, but it is of no value now. He must prove his love by his deeds. He must now act. The time has come for speedy action. Peter must not now sit down and eat of the fish which have been miraculously brought into

his net, and merely profess his love to his risen Lord, but he must now draw his sword from the scabbard, and go out into the open field and fight the great enemy, and fight him, too, to the very jaws of death.

"Verily, verily, I say unto thee, When thou wast young, thou girdest thyself, and walkedst whither thou wouldest: but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldest not. This spake He, signifying by what death He should glorify God. And when He had spoken this, He saith unto him, Follow Me." Tradition says that Peter was crucified with his head downwards. Whether tradition is correct on this occasion or not is a matter of little consequence. Our Lord undoubtedly refers to a painful death, and such we have every reason to believe was the end of this suffering, yet glorious martyr.

Peter here, to some extent, may represent our humanity. In youth we are strong; we have great expectations; we can overcome every obstacle; and although Jewish priests and Roman soldiers come out armed against us, we fear them not, and are ready to draw the sword in defence of what we think is right. But when old age creeps upon us, the spirit may grow stronger and stronger, yet the flesh grows weaker and weaker, and every year we find that the enemy is drawing the cords closer around us, and we are less able to resist, until, almost without a struggle, he forces us into the grave, carried bound whither we would not.

"This spake He, signifying by what death he

should glorify God. And when He had spoken this, He saith unto him, Follow Me." No doubt, suiting the action to the word, our Lord walked away some distance along the rocky shore, and Peter followed Him. But oh! what a different following this was to that first time when, three years before, Christ called him to follow Him. Oh! could our minds grasp the difference in these two events, we would see Peter's heart overflowing. In that first call he follows like a young soldier going to the battlefield, to carve his way with his sword to glory. The young Prince has come—the Messiah, the Son of David has come—to destroy the Roman yoke. Peter is brave now. His heart is filled with high expectations. It is a road to glory he is to travel now, to a seat by the side of David's Lord on His throne. But in this last following, how changed the scene. Along the shores of that silent sea he follows a supernatural being—a being not of earth; follows Him on a long, tedious journey through many lands, through sorrow, pain, suffering and martyrdom, death, the grave! Peter well knew what this following meant; but it was to follow Him to a crown, the meanest and poorest of whose jewels would outshine all the diadems of earth.

"Then Peter, turning about, seeth the disciple whom Jesus loved following; which also leaned on His breast at supper, and said, Lord, which is he that betrayeth Thee? Peter seeing him saith to Jesus, Lord, and what shall this man do? Jesus saith unto him, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? follow thou Me. Then went

this saying abroad among the brethren, that that disciple should not die: yet Jesus said not unto him, he shall not die; but, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?" Peter, turning around, saw John following also. Whether Peter was jealous, as some suppose, or whether he asked out of curiosity, we know not.

John was a very different person from Peter. His whole life was different; his whole disposition was different. *Peter here had been bidden* to follow his Lord, and he doubtless understood that this following was typical of the rest of his life, following his Lord through terrible suffering to a shameful death. But John follows unbidden. John follows at a distance. John's lot was probably not as severe as that of Peter. He lived to a good old age, and died a natural death. He did not follow his Lord through crucifixion, but he followed Him through much trial, and he followed Him, too, through the grave. Peter was carried to his death by his enemies—bound, forced, dragged to martyrdom. John tarried till the Lord Himself came and called him home.

"Jesus saith unto him, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? follow thou Me. Then went this saying abroad among the brethren, that that disciple should not die: yet Jesus said not unto him, He shall not die; but if I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? This is the disciple which testifieth of these things, and wrote these things: and we know that his testimony is true. And there are also many other things which Jesus did,

the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written. Amen." The error into which the disciples here fell is not an uncommon one. It had its foundation in a belief that Christ would soon come and establish a kingdom of Israel on earth, and that John would not die until He did come in that way. The coming which our Lord speaks of here is His coming at the hour of death, to receive the soul of the believer into His spiritual kingdom.

John must die, and like Peter pass through the grave, but not, like Peter, be thrust into the grave by sacrilegious hands; but gently carried home, in a ripe old age, by the Angel of the Covenant.

"Jesus saith unto him, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? follow thou Me." Here, now, we have the important lesson. No matter what I do with John, or James, or Paul; the road I mark out for you is for you alone; walk in it. To a superficial observer there is a similarity of roads. The general events of all are alike—sin, repentance, suffering, death. But in detail they are all divergent. Peter's road was marked out in the great drama of earth's history before the foundations of the world were laid. John's also. Peter must follow the Lord where that Lord leads. If Peter's road leads to Jerusalem, to Babylon, and thence to Rome, as tradition says, he must walk in it. If John's road leads to Ephesus and to Patmos, he must go there. But wherever it goes he will discover his Lord in it, and he must follow Him.

Both may start, that bright, sunshiny morning, along the shores of the sea of Galilee, and they both follow the supernatural vision which leads them on. But they soon lose sight of each other. One goes into banishment, and sees from the stormy shores of the Ægean sea the heavens opened, and beholds visions of glory which no other mortal ever beheld, while the other is dragged to the cross by his enemies.

Oh! whatever may be the lot which our risen Savior marks out for us, we must follow Him. It may be easier for others. Some are rich; some have a pleasant time in life; some spend a whole life of beatific vision, while others are in the mire of Despond, the Babylon of captivity. But no matter: "Follow thou Me." One apostle enjoys excellent health, while the whole life of another is filled with sickness and pain. No matter: "Follow thou Me." Oppressed with care, despised by the world, while others are rich: "Follow thou Me."

"Then gathered the chief priests and the Pharisees a council, and said, What do we? for this Man doeth many miracles. If we let Him thus alone, all men will believe on Him: and the Romans shall come and take away both our place and nation. And one of them, named Caiaphas, being the high priest that same year, said unto them, Ye know nothing at all, nor consider that it is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not. And this spake he not of himself: but being high priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation; and not for that nation only, but that also He should gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad. Then

from that day forth they took counsel together for to put Him to death. Jesus therefore walked no more openly among the Jews; but went thence unto a country near to the wilderness, into a city called Ephraim, and there continued with His disciples."—JOHN xi. 47-54.

WE have already traced this narrative up to the point in which Mary meets with Jesus outside of the little town where they live, and He is filled with indignation on seeing the tears of the hypocritical mourners mingled with those of the pious sisters.

"And said, Where have ye laid him? They say unto Him, Lord, come and see. Jesus wept." Why should Jesus weep, is a question that has been asked by Bible students for ages. And did He as man not have reason to weep? "He who endured such contradiction of sinners against Himself," beholding such hypocrisy, and knowing that it was all instigated by that foul spirit that had from the beginning filled our world with deception, falsehood, murder, sorrow, and death. No wonder that Jesus wept, when He saw the world so completely under the power of Satan, and all the terrible effects of the fall pass before His vision—sin and misery and death,—the seed of the serpent ever battling and warring with the seed of the woman, piercing, wounding, destroying.

"Jesus wept. Then said the Jews, Behold, how He loved him; and some of them said, Could not this Man, which opened the eyes of the blind, have caused that even this man should not have died? Jesus therefore again groaning in himself cometh to the grave. It was a cave, and a stone lay upon it." Some of the Jews said, "See how He loved

him." Some supposed that these were tears of sympathy alone, and that He was grieved for the loss of a dear friend. But others asked, "Could not this Man, which opened the eyes of the blind, have caused that even this man should not have died?" This was as much as to say, "If it were true, as they report, that He opened the eyes of the blind, what was there to prevent Him from causing that this man should not have died?" We can expect nothing but a caviling spirit from such people as this. A few days before it was reported that Jesus had opened the eyes of one born blind. They would not believe it. Nor do they believe now that He had power to prevent Lazarus from dying.

"Jesus therefore again groaning in Himself cometh to the grave. It was a cave, and a stone lay upon it." Jesus was again filled with indignation, and coming to the grave, at once commanded them to remove the stone from the mouth of the sepulchre.

The description of eastern sepulchres has been given by travellers. Dr. Clark discovered, and has fully described, a number of sepulchres which extend along the side of the ravine to the south-west and west of Mount Zion. He describes them as a number of subterranean chambers hewn with considerable art, each containing one or many repositories for the dead, like cisterns carved in the rock, upon the sides of the chambers; the doors are so low that, to look into any one of them, it is necessary to stoop, and in some instances to creep on the hands and knees. "Then arose Peter, and ran unto the sepulchre; and

stooping down he beheld the linen clothes laid by themselves, and departed, wondering in himself at that which was come to pass." The tombs still exist in the form of caverns, on the sides of the hills that rise from the shore of the lake. They extend at a distance for more than a mile from the present town. Where I have been in South America only wealthy people possess these vaults, the poorer people being buried in common graves. If the same custom prevailed in the east in our Savior's time, it would indicate that this family was in no mean circumstances. The large assemblage of mourners, and the very costly box of ointment with which Mary anoints our Savior's feet, are also indications that they were not wanting in this world's goods.

"Jesus therefore again groaning in Himself cometh to the grave. It was a cave, and a stone lay upon it. Jesus said, Take ye away the stone. Martha, the sister of him that was dead, saith unto Him, Lord, by this time he stinketh; for he hath been dead four days. Jesus saith unto her, Said I not unto thee that if thou wouldest believe, thou shouldest see the glory of God." I can see nothing else indicated than a momentary fluctuation of Martha's faith. She was already beginning to doubt our Lord's power, when she remembered that her brother had been dead four days, and consequently expresses her doubt, and is promptly answered by Jesus. I see no proof that the corpse was already fetid, corrupted, and that the worms were preying upon it. Such may have been the case, but I can find no proof for it. The sepulchre was closed with a great stone,

and Martha had no means of knowing what was the condition of the corpse. She speaks from a general experience of what would have been the result of a corpse lying four days in a tomb in a warm climate. But this corpse may have been preserved from all corruption.

"Then they took away the stone from the place where the dead was laid. And Jesus lifted up His eyes, and said, Father, I thank Thee that Thou hast heard Me. And I knew that Thou hearest Me always; but because of the people which stand by I said it, that they may believe that Thou hast sent Me. And when He thus had spoken, He cried with a loud voice, Lazarus, come forth." Notice this this prayer. A prayer to the Father—not asking anything—giving thanks only that the Father hears Him, clearly indicating that the miracle that He would perform would be by His own power, and yet proving to the Jews that stood by that He was united with the Father in heaven.

"And when He thus had spoken, He cried with a loud voice, Lazarus, come forth. And he that was dead came forth, bound hand and foot with grave clothes; and his face was bound about with a napkin. Jesus saith unto them, Loose him, and let him go." "Lazarus, come forth" is spoken in His own power. The same voice that called Lazarus from the grave is that voice which calls sinners from spiritual death, and will call the dead to Himself when He shall descend from heaven with a shout; and no doubt this same voice is that which is called elsewhere the "trump of the archangel."

"Loose him, and let him go" was merely to loosen the grave clothes, so that he could move freely, and walk with them back to his home in Bethany; for it must be remembered that, according to Jewish custom, these graves were a long way from their dwellings.

"Then many of the Jews which came to Mary, and had seen the things which Jesus did, believed on Him. But some of them went their ways to the Pharisees, and told them what things Jesus had done." John here drops the narrative, so far as Lazarus and his family are concerned, and goes on to tell us what effect this miracle had on the Jews. "Some believed on Him." Instead of being persecutors, as they had hitherto been, desiring to stone Jesus, they now became believers; but others went and related what had been done to the Pharisees.

"Then gathered the chief priests and the Pharisees a counsel, and said, What do we? for this man doeth many miracles. If we let Him thus alone, all men will believe on Him; and the Romans shall come and take away both our place and nation." And now observe the conduct of these wicked men. They admit that He is performing many miracles, and in doing so admit His just claim to the Messiahship; but just here worldly interest steps in, and justice is gagged and blindfolded. These would-be holy man can see nothing but their own interest, and they are willing to sell the King of Israel—yes, and their own souls, too—for the sake of a small quantity of Satan's gold. And oh! how many men to-day sell their characters, and their interest in heaven,

and the Lord Jesus, and the Church, and its interests, and their own souls also, for a few ounces of shining metal. A few sordid pleasures here in this life are of far more value to them than a heaven of eternal joy.

"And one of them, named Caiaphas, being the high priest that same year, said unto them, Ye know nothing at all. Nor consider that it is expedient for us that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not. And this spake he not of himself, but being high priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation; and not for that nation only, but that also He should gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad. Then from that day forth they took counsel together for to put Him to death. Jesus therefore walked no more openly among the Jews; but went thence into a country near to the wilderness, into a city called Ephraim, and there continued with His disciples." Here we have a veritable prophecy delivered by a bold, bad man. God can use human instrumentality to give true prophecies of coming events. Balaam's prophecy was not only a magnificent prophecy, but it was a true prophecy. The inscription written by Pilate, and placed upon the cross, was not only a prophecy, but it was a true prophecy. We find no difficulty here. John says that he was "high priest that same year," and some have thought that they found a discrepancy here, because it is well known that Caiaphas was chief priest for ten years. Some have answered this, by saying that the office of high priest was

bought and sold by the Romans every year; but I do not think that John refers to this. The meaning is simply this, that he was high priest at that time.

"The children of God that were scattered abroad," I do not think refers to the Gentiles, as many commentators have supposed, but only to those Jews who were scattered in foreign countries, and such Gentiles as had become proselytes to their religion. This, I think, is the fulfilment of the prophecy, as far as the Jewish mind was concerned. Prophecies that the Gentiles should be gathered in through the death of Christ are abundant in the Old Testament, but the Jews of that period never dreamed that it would be done in the way it was.

"Then from that day forth they took counsel together for to put Him to death." Without any sense of justice whatever, they seek to put Jesus to death. They never inquire whether He is guilty or not; they never inquire whether they have a right to put Him to death or not; but settling down upon the positive fact that prophecy had condemned Him to death, they considered that they had a perfect right to constitute themselves His executioners. It is just this superficial view—this narrow, cramped, hard-hearted, bull-headed disposition—that induces thousands at the present day to believe anything and everything rather than believe the truth, because the truth, like hidden treasures, requires to be excavated and examined, and may be found entirely different from all our preconceived notions of right and wrong. We find at work in the hearts of these scribes and Pharisees three great elements which

Satan ever uses to blind, and bind, and lead captive at his will. *First*, worldly interest. Fearing to lose their worldly fortunes, or in some way get themselves in bad odor with the Romans, and thus affect their social standing or their fortunes, they do not hesitate to do that which is an enormous crime—no less than murder—put to death an innocent man, they themselves being the guilty offenders. *Second*, pride. They are not willing to humble themselves. If the Romans are to be conquered, it must be done by a noble display of arms. They were a warlike nation, and had been from the days of Moses. The doctrine of Jesus, if accepted by the nation, would annihilate this martial spirit. It would turn the nation into a nation of women, and thus make it an easy prey to the Roman arms. No; this man must be put to death. His influence is most pernicious. His peace measures will ruin our nation. *Third*, that listless, lazy, idle spirit that accepts for granted every plausible story the devil chooses to circulate, without examining a truth, and yet, as they receive it, it was a falsehood. And so with thousands of errors: truth out of place.

PART FOURTH.

SERMONS.

I. SAMSON, A TYPE OF A CHAMPION OF THE LAW.

"But the Philistines took him, and put out his eyes, and brought him down to Gaza, and bound him with fetters of brass; and he did grind in the prison house."—JUDGES xvi. 21.

"Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?"—ROMANS vi. 16.

OUR subject is a difficult one. The character of of Samson is a puzzle to the believer and the sport of the infidel. It is a subject that will bear study; and the more it is investigated, the more instructive does it appear. Samson is a remarkable character. He is apparently a shapeless block of granite that can be fitted nowhere in the spiritual building of the Christian religion. His place there is difficult to find. By some, Samson is supposed to be a type of Christ. Roman Catholic interpreters so regard him, and in this opinion they are followed by Protestant expositors. Great error prevails in explaining the types of the Old Testament. Many expositors are constantly on the watch for types of Christ, and wherever they find something that ap-

pears on the surface to bear some analogy to an event in the life of our Savior, they imagine that they have discovered a type of Him. Yet the very next chapter, being a portion of the life of the same individual, might just as appropriately be explained as a type of the devil.

By many, David is supposed to be a type of Christ; but can that licentious king, who committed adultery with Uriah's wife, and then murdered her husband, be a type of the pure and holy Savior? Still less can Samson be so regarded. Can any one believe that this big, blundering fool was a type of the Redeemer?

Now, in order that we may understand the Old Testament types, we must class them, and arrange each in its own separate department, and then we shall see that each one fills its own proper sphere from beginning to end.

Samson belongs to a period commencing with the entrance into Canaan and ending with David, which appears to represent a carnal priesthood under the law; while David, on the other hand, appears to introduce a period typical of a ministry under the gospel.

Samson, then, may be called *a champion of the law;* or, perhaps better still, *our Adamic nature under the law.* David, again, may represent a champion under the first teachings of the gospel, and some parts of his life bear a close resemblance to some things in the life of Christ; but it is because this king of Israel was a type of the gospel believer, and consequently reflected more or less the image of

Christ, who worketh in the believer to will and to do of His own good pleasure.

Who, then, was Samson? To what dispensation does he belong? to that of the law or the gospel? What does his name signify? A servant. Now, the law holds in bondage, the gospel makes free. Samson, the servant, represents bondage. He was typical, then, of servitude to the law.

The Jew was born in Canaan, which is a type of the dominion of the law; he was consecrated to God at his birth, circumcised on the eighth day, ate no unclean food, observed all the requirements of the ceremonial law, and continued to remain pure through life by means of this observance. If he sinned against the moral law, the observance of the ceremonial law was necessary to his forgiveness and restoration. This was his strength. The ceremonial law is a type of Christ.

Samson was a Nazarite from his birth. His parents had consecrated him by a solemn vow to God. He was to drink no wine, nor was his hair ever to be shorn. The moment that vow was thus broken, he lost his strength, just as a common Jew became impure the moment he broke the ceremonial law.

Now, the whole of Samson's life unfolds itself to our view. On his way to Timnath, a lion met him, and we are told that "The Spirit of the Lord came mightily upon him, and he rent him as he would have rent a kid." Now Satan, who goes about as a roaring lion, can have no power to injure where God's law is not transgressed. If not morally and actually so, the Jew was pure by that which is typified by the

ceremonial law. But if they neglect this purification, they are unclean and guilty.

Then, again, we are told that the Spirit of the Lord came upon him, and he slew a thousand Philistines with the jawbone of an ass. An easy thing to do, so long as he kept himself pure by observing the vow of the Nazarite. Human strength can proclaim the law. The tongue of many weaker than Samson has slain its thousands, and then deliberately satisfied its own thirst from the antidote of the law. But when slain by the law, it requires a mightier than Samson to make them alive again. God is not in the earthquake, but in the still, small voice.

Then Samson goes down to the city of Gaza, and the Philistines shut him in and put a guard around the gates. But he arose at midnight, and took the two gates and the two posts and bar and carried them to a hill before Hebron, seven miles distant. Samson had sinned—committed a grievous sin—yet he lost not his strength. All went well till his Nazarite vow was broken.

It is not the breaking of the law that condemns the soul to death, but the refusal of the antidote. Even the gates of hell cannot prevail against him whose strength is in Jehovah, even be it but the shadow as possessed by Old Testament believers and pious children of the present day.

But Samson falls into Delilah's hands, and day by day she wove the net around him, until his seven locks were shorn away, and his strength gone; and his eyes are put out, and he is made to grind in the prison-house.

And who was Delilah? Commentators say that Delilah was *sin*. Not so. Samson had sinned before, but no such direful results had followed. What made the difference? Delilah had taken away the antidote to sin. Delilah is *unbelief*—that foul, polluted monster, *unbelief*.

That Nazarite vow, which had shielded him from the power of the lion, and had torn away the gates of Gaza, and preserved him from so many dangers, is now removed; and now the law comes down upon him with all its force, crushing him beneath its weight. "Whosoever falls upon this rock shall be broken, but on whomsoever it falls, it shall grind him to powder." The law without an antidote is a mighty millstone around the sinner's neck.

It was while asleep that his hair was shorn. Unbelief puts to sleep. Had he remained awake, no such result would have followed. Behold here a warning of the danger of spiritual sleep! While men slept, the enemy sowed tares. While the disciples slept, the Savior was betrayed into the hands of His enemies. While the virgins slept, the cry came, "Behold, the bridegroom cometh."

When his hair was shorn, "The Lord departed from him." The Lord departs from those who reject the law's antidote. Even while in the company of the harlot of Gaza, the Lord was with Samson; but when his vow was broken, he was left abandoned and alone, weak, helpless as an infant; and the Philistines took him and put out his eyes, and brought him down to Gaza, and bound him with

fetters of brass; and he did grind in the prison-house. Unbelief delivers over into the hands of sin.

Alas! poor Samson! What a mighty power sin is to put out the eyes. Oh! how it blinds men to the interests of their souls, to their homes, families, friends, honesty, happiness, eternal destiny! Oh! how it binds with brazen fetters, fretting their way through the flesh. Oh! how it enslaves. "Ye are sold under sin,"—slaves to sin. It sends its victim to the prison house of despair, grinding away in agony and despair here, and in death consigning him to the prison-house of hell.

Later, a feast is held in honor of Dagon, their god, and they rejoice over their enemy, even sending for the poor, blind captive that they might make sport of him. But in the meantime he had repented, his hair had grown, his Nazarite vow was being gradually restored to him, and his strength was returning; and he prays—oh! we can sympathize with that prayer—"O Lord God, remember me, I pray Thee, and strengthen me, I pray Thee, only this once, O God, that I may at once be avenged of the Philistines for my two eyes." And he takes hold of the pillars, and he bowed himself with all his might.

The most wonderful thing in the whole history of this strange being is, that in avenging himself he himself dies with the uncircumcised. His own body lies mangled in that heap of ruins.

When the champion of the law, killed by sin, returns to Christ, he dies for ever to sin. Saul of

Tarsus, sitting at the feet of Gamaliel, and for many years the champion of the law persecuting the disciples of Jesus, was the slave of sin, blind, fettered, and in prison; but when the ruins of old Dagon's temple, like a lightning flash, fell crashing around him on the way to Damascus, Saul was killed—killed for ever. He who was gathered up out of the ruins was not *Saul* the champion of the law, but *Paul* the apostle, the champion of the gospel. When we are freed from the law by a return to Christ, the carnal nature is killed; it dies along with its sins. Oh! ye who to-day grind in the prison-house of sin, cry to Him who is mighty to save. He will give you the victory over the carnal nature, and free you from the law. Hear what He says: "For the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death; and if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sins; but the spirit is life, because of righteousness. For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God; for ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear, but ye have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God, and if children, then heirs; heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ."

II. DAVID A TYPE OF A CHAMPION OF THE GOSPEL.

"So David prevailed over the Philistine with a sling and with a stone, and smote the Philistine, and slew him; but there was no sword in the hand of David."—1 SAM. xvii. 50.

IN Stephen's apology to the Jews, he appears to classify the different periods of Jewish history. One of these periods commences with the entrance of the people of Israel under the leadership of Joshua, and ends with the days of Saul. Then with David commences a new era. Joshua was a general at the head of an army. We may consider Joshua and Moses as performing the same work—Moses preparing the way for an entrance into Canaan, and Joshua completing the work, or rather carrying the warfare into the open field. The history of the Israelites during the times of the Judges and under Saul appears to belong to this period. The wars recorded here were wars with the Canaanites, while the wars after David's time were mostly political dissensions among themselves—civil wars. David was in reality the first legitimate king. Up to this time the nation appears to have been typically subject to Christ, more in His character of a priest than of a king. Now His character of a sovereign is introduced. True, there had been two kings over Israel before this time. Abimelech was for a time a sort of self-constituted king, but his authority was only over a few wicked followers, and he soon came to an untimely end.

You remember how Saul was made king. The

people had become tired of being ruled by a priest, and demanded a king. Saul was given to them. Saul was not the legitimate king that God chose as a representative of His own Son. A vial of oil was poured over Saul. A whole horn of oil over David. The name "David" means beloved. Throughout the prophecies and the New Testament reference is made to David in intimate connection with Christ. Christ is called the Son of David, and David's Lord, and represented at sitting upon the throne of David, while Ezekiel speaks of Christ as though He were David himself. No such reference is ever made to Saul.

You will see at once a perfect analogy between the kingship of Saul, ending a priestly dominion, commencing well and fading away in dishonor, to be followed by a king who rules well, and whose office is represented in prophetic language as one that is eternal, and the fading away of the old Mosaic dispensation, containing but a germ or shadow of regeneration, to be followed by the kingly office of Christ in the New Testament dispensation.

Some time before David's conquest over Goliath, he had been anointed by Samuel to be king over Israel. He was the Lord's anointed one among his brethren. Christ was anointed by the Holy Ghost at His baptism. Saul sat upon the throne at the time of David's anointing, and maintained his position for some time after; in fact, the victory over Goliath was gained while Saul was yet king. Christ was anointed for the gospel ministry under the old

covenant, and died under the old covenant—suffering without the gate. Until David had received this anointing he remained in his father's house, tending his father's flock. Until Christ was anointed He was only known as the carpenter's Son. In like manner the disciples also were commanded to tarry at Jerusalem until anointed by the Holy Spirit. After being anointed David went out to the battle. His brethren received him not, but ridiculed and derided him. Christ came unto His own brethren, and they received Him not—they despised and rejected Him.

The apostles carried the glad tidings of a risen Savior to their own brethren, the Jews, with the same result. And while upon the battlefield the champion of the Philistines appears, and defies the armies of the living God,—blasphemes the God of Israel. And David's heart is filled with indignation. He hears the reward offered. The king's daughter is the promised reward. Christ's reward is the Church—the daughter of the Great King. David rejects the warrior's weapons. The sword, and coat of mail, and helmet, and shield are all cast aside. He chooses his own weapons. These are five smooth stones out of the running brook. A running brook, you know, is an emblem of the gospel. Christ rejected all carnal weapons. The Jews supposed that the Messiah would come to repeat the conquests of Joshua. They were willing to make Him a king. Had He given permission, thousands would have been ready to draw the sword, as was Peter.

"Not by power nor might, but by My Spirit saith the Lord." He goes to meet the champion, and is ridiculed (vs. 43.) David goes in the name of the Lord of hosts (vs. 45.) David hurls a stone at the giant, and it sinks into his forehead. Mind, we are not told that it struck him in the breast, or loins, or hand, or foot. Christ crushed the serpent's head. And when the giant was fallen upon his face on the ground David ran to him. He cut off his head with his own sword.

Stop here a moment. Think a moment. You HAVE ALL SEEN A ROMAN SWORD! Fix it in your imagination. Now turn it point downwards, and what do you behold? A cross.

Satan comes against the Prince of David with a Roman cross, but the cross is turned into a flaming sword, pursuing and burning the enemy even down to the lowest hell. "They that take the sword shall perish by the sword." Again and again Satan's armies have rushed forth from the gates of his empire, armed with the sword, to exterminate the Church of Christ. They have all perished by the sword, and the Church lives; she has triumphed. The enemy's champion slain, David's brethren are filled with courage, and pursue the enemy. The Christian triumphs. And now we see the champion of Israel marching proudly away from the battlefield, carrying in his own right hand the bloody head of the giant enemy of Israel's God. Look at it; scan these features, if you know anything about spiritual physiognomy. Oh, the horrid monster, sin; and this is

sin in its most terrible shape, for the name of Goliath means rebellion. Cruelty, and murder, and lust, and hatred, and revenge—all, all are clearly delineated there. But fear not; the monster is dead. "The sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is the law; but thanks be to God which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."

Brethren, the battlefield is before us. Are you ready to engage in the conflict? If not, tarry with your father's sheep on the mountain side until you have learned the use of the sling, and received the anointing of the Spirit from on high. If you have received that anointing, let no rude hand detain you. Put not on Saul's armor. Your brethren may insinuate that it would be better for you to see that your father's few sheep are not subject to the tender mercies of the lion and the bear, rather than to dream of liberating Israel's flock from the champion of Philistia. Heed them not. Onward to the battle. Choose for yourself good, smooth arguments from the running fountain—God's living word—and hurl them at the head of the enemy. Do not leave the work half done. When the enemy falls, make sure work of him. Cut his head off. Crush out the Goliath of rebellion. Allow none but the legitimate King of Israel to sit on David's throne. And when the victory is sure, then we will sing with the maidens of Israel, "Saul hath slain his thousands, and David his ten thousands."

III. JOSHUA'S CONQUEST OF CANAAN.

"Which also our fathers that came after brought in with Jesus into the possession of the Gentiles, whom God drave out before the face of our fathers unto the days of David."—Acts vii. 45.

The Jesus spoken of in our text is Joshua, the son of Nun—Jesus being the Greek, and Joshua the Hebrew form, of the same name.

Our subject is the taking of Palestine by Israel under Joshua; a subject but seldom presented from the pulpit, and but little understood by the people. That it is attended with difficulties cannot be denied. Infidels have used it in assailing the truth of the Bible, and for vituperating the character of God, representing Him as giving countenance to cruelty, injustice, perfidy, and murder. It has been a "stumbling stone and rock of offense even in the Church." Even in our own denomination, ministers have been accused of preaching erroneous doctrines, and put on trial for denying the inspiration of that portion of Scripture that records this conquest. Witness, for example, the trial of Rev. David Swing by his Presbytery.

In order that we may understand the subject thoroughly, let us, in the first place, consider its historical character; second, its typical character; and third, the lessons to be derived from it.

First, in a historical point of view. Can Joshua and his followers be justified for the course they pursued? I think they can. First, we must consider the dispensation under which Joshua lived. We have derived our ideas of mercy and benevolence from the

gospel. Joshua knew no gospel. He was a blind slave to the law. The great type of the gospel was the water used in their purifications, but never used until the victim had been condemned to death by a sprinkling of blood. There were a few outsiders that he could show mercy to, but to those born and raised within the bounds of the land promised to his fathers no mercy was to be shown.

In the *first* place, God had given the land of Canaan to the Israelites, and God has a perfect right to give His own territory to whom He pleases. It was first promised to Abraham when the Lord brought him out of the land of Haran, and afterwards confirmed by a solemn covenant. It was again promised to Isaac. It was also promised to Jacob. Then Moses was especially called of God, who appeared to him in the burning bush, to go down into Egypt. Referring to the fathers, God says: "I have established my covenant with them, to give them the land of Canaan, the land of their pilgrimage wherein they were strangers." These promises were repeated again and again during the whole forty years.

We see, then, that God gave the land to Israel, with its inhabitants and all it contained, by will and deed, and solemn covenant, not to do with the inhabitants what *they* pleased, but what He commanded. And certainly no one will question God's right to dispose of His own property as He pleases.

In the *second* place, the seven nations that inhabited Canaan were destined by God Himself to be destroyed. They were wicked idolaters. God told

Abraham that his seed must dwell in Egypt; "for," says He, "the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full." And Moses tells them that it was not for their own righteousness that the Lord brought them into this land, but "for the wickedness of these nations the Lord doth drive them out from before thee."

Now, no one will deny God's right to destroy a people for their wickedness. Nor will any one deny His right to choose His own instruments for their destruction. He had the same right to commission Joshua and his followers to destroy them as He had to send the waters of the flood, or to destroy Sodom and Gomorrah.

In the *third* place, the Canaanites were not ignorant of their condemnation. Moses, in one of his prayers, says, the Canaanites "have heard that Thou, Lord, art among this people, and that Thou, Lord, art seen face to face, and that Thy cloud standeth over them, and that Thou goest before them, by daytime in a pillar of a cloud, and in a pillar of fire by night." Then, again, when he sent messengers unto the king of Edom, asking permission to pass through his territory, he says: "Thou knowest all the travail that hath befallen us; how our fathers went down into Egypt, and we dwelt in Egypt a long time, and the Egyptians vexed us and our fathers; and when we cried unto the Lord, He heard our voice, and sent an angel, and hath brought us forth out of Egypt."

Then, again, Balaam the prophet speaks of himself as one "which heard the words of God, and

knew the knowledge of the Most High." And then says: "There shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel, and shall smite the corners of Moab, and destroy all the children of Sheth."

Again, the harlot Rahab speaks thus: "I know that the Lord hath given you the land, and that your terror has fallen upon us, and that all the inhabitants of the land faint because of you; for we have heard how the Lord dried up the Red sea for you when ye came out of Egypt, and what ye did unto the two kings of the Amorites that were on the other side of Jordan, Sihon and Og, whom ye utterly destroyed. And as soon as we had heard these things, our hearts did melt, neither did there remain any more courage in any man because of you; for the Lord your God, He is God, in heaven above and in earth beneath."

Then, again, when the Gibeonites met the Israelites they confessed to Joshua, "From a very far country thy servants are come, because of the name of the Lord thy God; for we have heard of the fame of Him, and all that He did in Egypt, and all that He did to the two kings of the Amorites." Then, when they were accused of their deception, "they answered Joshua and said: Because it was certainly told thy servants, how that the Lord thy God commanded his servant Moses to give you all the land, and to destroy all the inhabitants of the land from before you; therefore we were sore afraid of our lives because of you, and have done this thing."

Now, in the *fourth* place, the Israelites did not

destroy the Canaanites by their own will, but by the direct commandment of God. They were strictly given to understand that they were soldiers fighting under Him as their chief and leader, and not for themselves.

God says to Moses, "*I* will bring you into the land;" "*I* will dwell among the children of Israel, and will be their God." And He says to the people, "*I* will send an angel before thee, and *I* will drive out the Canaanite." "The *Lord* will drive out these nations before you." "There shall no man be able to stand before you; for the *Lord your God* shall lay the fear of you and the dread of you upon all the land that ye shall tread upon, as He hath said unto you."

And then, at the close of Joshua's career, God tells them, "The *Lord your God* is He that hath fought for you." "And I sent the hornet before you, which drave them out from before you;" and warns them that if they forsake Him, *He* will destroy them. "As the nations which the *Lord* destroyeth before your face, so shall ye perish, because ye would not be obedient unto the voice of the Lord your God." Then they were strictly commanded to do nothing but what they were ordered to do by God Himself.

When the Israelites, after the return of the spies, found that they had sinned, God told them that "whoever did anything presumptuously should be cut off from among his people." Now, I repeat, that men under the leadership of God Himself commit no sin when they do just what He has com-

manded them to do. And it is acknowledged by all that God has the same right to destroy a nation by human instrumentality that He has by earthquake and famine.

But then there were thousands of infants perished in Canaan. These could not have been idolaters? So there were in Sodom; so there were in the antediluvian world. They did not perish on account of any crime that they had committed, but as a result of Adam's sin—a curse which Christ did not remove, and never promised to remove. He did not promise to cure man's wounded heel. The death of the body is not the penalty of the sin of the soul. Believers all die. The punishment of those adults was not the mere death of the body. The children were all saved. The Bible teaches it as plainly as it does the doctrine of the Trinity.

IV. ORIGINAL SIN: SECOND PART OF JOSHUA'S CONQUEST.

"For I was alive without the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died."—Rom. vii. 9.

Paul, in this passage, means just what he says. Those who say that Paul was born dead in trespasses and in sins deny this, and say that it was Paul's own self-esteem that was killed. Nothing of the kind. Paul's death was not on the way to Damascus, nor was he killed by the more than noon-day glory which he then beheld. He had sat at Gamaliel's feet, and had been killed by the law, the sword of

the Spirit, as much as any Canaanite ever was carnally by Joshua's sword.

But I promised this morning to examine the typical character of Joshua's conquest.

Most expositors consider the books of the Bible beginning with Joshua and ending with Nehemiah as merely historical. Christ knew no such distinction as that would imply. "Moses and the prophets," according to Him, comprehend all of the Old Testament. If you make the book of Joshua a mere history, then you must condemn me for heresy, for I cannot believe that, as a mere history, it was inspired for all time. Make it a prophecy, and I can accept it as the word of God, inspired for all time.

The forty years in the desert were a type of that period represented by the court of the tabernacle. Canaan, then, represents that period indicated by the sanctuary. The sword of Joshua was typical of *the law*. The law knows no mercy. Canaan now is the Christian world. Those to whom God shows some mercy are those outside of the Christian world, whose only law is the light of nature. These know not the law of Moses. The law kills. So says Joshua, and so says Paul. God's word declares it everywhere.

If I am right in regarding Joshua's sword as a type of the law, then the Canaanites were alive before the law reached them, for what is already dead cannot be killed. Now, if you will bear with me a few minutes, I think that I can present the doctrine of original sin in so clear a light that all can under-

stand it. There have been in the Church three different hypotheses in regard to original sin:

First, Pelagianism, which considers it dishonorable to God to impute Adam's sin to his posterity. It acknowledges that all men are sinners, and begin to sin as soon as they are capable of moral action. This system has its difficulties. Infants suffer and die, proving them to be under the penalty of Adam's sin. It is a system that is nowhere taught in the Bible, and has been condemned as heresy by the councils of the Church.

The second, Semi-Pelagianism. This doctrine teaches that the posterity of Adam inherit from him his mortal body and sinful nature, but that they are not exposed to any penalty until they have committed actual transgression. It admits natural corruption, but not natural depravity.

But this system does not correspond with the Scriptures. Although the death of the body is not a penalty for any actual transgression in a son of Adam, yet the Bible teaches that it is a result of sin. Moreover, it is contrary to such passages as these: "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." "As it is written, there is none righteous, no, not one; there is none that understandeth; there is none that seeketh after God." "They are all gone out of the way; they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one." "For there is not a just man upon the earth that doeth good, and that sinneth not."

Here I would say that I present this statement of Semi-Pelagianism as I suppose it to have been taught by its advocates. No two authors agree as to its exact character. Arminius is said to have accepted its doctrines, and even at this late date there is a diversity of opinion on this point.

We now come to what is called Calvinism. This you will find in synopsis in the answer to the sixteenth question in the Shorter Catechism: "The covenant being made with Adam, not only for himself, but for his posterity, all mankind descending from him by ordinary generation sinned in him, and fell with him in his first transgression." And the passages of Scripture usually quoted in support of it are: "In Adam all die." "By one man's disobedience many were made sinners." "By the offense of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation."

But this system presents its difficulties, nor do Calvinists pretend to deny it. Rev. Samuel Miller, a D. D. and professor, says, (I quote his own words): "It is not pretended that the Calvinistic system is free from all difficulties. When finite creatures are called to scan either the works or the revealed will of an Infinite Being, they must be truly demented if they expect to find nothing which they cannot comprehend. Accordingly, when we undertake to solve some of the difficulties which that system of Christian doctrine usually styled Calvinism presents, it cannot be denied that 'such knowledge is too wonderful for us; it is high, we cannot attain to it.'"

The difficulty here is very palpable indeed, and is

not in God's word, nor in the clear statement of man's original sin, but in the distorted view taken of the operations of the law and the gospel. The passages from Scripture are not properly quoted. "As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive." "*Shall*" is in the future tense. "By the offense of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." "Christ died for all." "He tasted death for every man." "He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world." "Behold the Lamb of God." "As was the transgression, so is the free gift." By Christ every child of Adam is made alive from Adam's sin. Then the law comes and kills them. To say that the law can kill a dead man is sheer nonsense. To say that they are born dead in trespasses and sins is to give the lie to the whole system of divine revelation. Every drop of blood that Christ shed contradicts it. Every sacrifice on Jewish altars denies it. Every man, woman and child that perished by Joshua's sword opposes it. All cry out against such a theory. We have only to compare Dr. Miller's language with that of St. Paul, in order to see the difficulty as plain as a sunbeam. The Princeton professor says, "That the *gospel* finds all men by *nature* dead in trespasses and sins, destitute alike of the image and favor of God." Can a child be born dead in trespasses? You might as well say a child can be born a murderer, or a forger. The gospel never finds

men in a state of nature. It finds them dead—killed by the law, and restores them to life.

Paul says, referring to men who had been killed by the law, "And you hath he quickened who were dead in trespasses and sins, wherein ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air;" and then, referring to man's natural condition, comparing the Jews (to which he belonged) with the Gentiles, he says, "We were children of wrath even as others."

Christ restores all to life from Adam's sin. The law kills them. Unless restored to life by the gospel, they remain dead to all eternity—buried in the second death. To teach that all children are born dead in trespasses and sins, and remain so until quickened by the gospel, is to teach infant damnation. To say that they are saved by election, is to lay upon election a burden which it is no more able to bear than the infant Samson was to bear the gates of Gaza. Christ's blood alone, not election, can save them; and if that blood is only applied to them through the hearing of the gospel, then they are lost. Calvin taught no such doctrine. He taught that they are saved by a supernatural cleansing given to all the children of Adam by the grace of Christ. He says: "For if they must be left among the children of Adam, they must be left in death. On the contrary, Christ commands them to be brought to Him. Why? Because He is Life. To give them life, therefore, He makes them partakers of Himself."

Here Calvin speaks the truth, but he does not tell

us how this supernatural cleansing comes. We say, then, that in Adam all die; in Christ all are made alive. But the Bible speaks of a second death. The law comes and kills them. The gospel restores them to life. Now we understand the words of the text, "Sin revived." The sin of Adam revived under the law, and spiritual death was the consequence.

V. MELCHISEDEC.

"The Lord swear and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec."—HEB. vii. 21.

I FEEL fully persuaded that whoever will examine this chapter carefully cannot fail to see that Melchisedec is Christ Himself; not the Jesus of the New Testament, but the Jehovah of the Old.

Now, it is objected that if Melchisedec was not a type of Christ, and a mere man, then Christ could not be called "after the order of Melchisedec." Let us see if such is the case:

1*st*, Besides the spiritual priesthood of all believers, there are but two priesthoods mentioned in the Bible. The one is the reality and the other is the type. Now, Christ did not belong to the order of Aaron, but was of the tribe of Judah. Nor did Melchisedec belong to the order of Aaron. That Melchisedec was not of the order of Aaron is positive proof that his was not a typical priesthood. The Jews were a typical nation. From Abraham down, all the nation bears a typical relation to the new cov-

enant; but Melchisedec did not belong to these, and therefore was not typical. Christ, then, not belonging to the order of Aaron, but to the order of Melchisedec, is shown to be one and the same with Melchisedec.

2*nd*, The priesthood of Melchisedec is eternal. (See verse 3.) It is usually said that his genealogy was unknown—that no one knew who his father and mother were. Paul does not express himself in such equivocal language as this. If Paul had intended to have told us that the father and mother were unknown, he would have used plainer language than this. Paul means to tell us that his priesthood is eternal. There is but one eternal priesthood, and that is not the order of Aaron, or any like him. This language does not for a single moment admit the idea that the order of Melchisedec is temporary. It is eternal, and the text proves it. The order of Aaron was temporary, and this is the distinguishing feature which Paul presents here—that in which it was different from the priesthood of Christ and Melchisedec.

3*rd*, Again, the names applied to Melchisedec belong to Christ. (Verse 2.)

4*th*, Again, Melchisedec was greater than Abraham. (Read from verse 4 to 11.) You see, then, that the whole priesthood of Levi paid tithes, recognizing a greater priest than any that ever existed in Israel. Who could this be but Christ?

5*th*, There is not a particle of proof that such a place as Salem existed in Abraham's time. Mount

Moriah is situated in Jerusalem; but it was not to a city that Abraham went to offer up Isaac.

6*th*, Had there existed in a walled city of Judea in Abraham's time such a pure and holy priesthood there would have still been a remnant when Joshua entered that land. Remnants of the Samaritans exist to-day. The Nestorians, as descendants of the wise men of the east, still exist. But there are no traces here, although the Scriptures tell us that his priesthood is eternal.

7*th*, We are told that Melchisedec is a priest now (verse 3)—that he abideth continually.

8*th*, Christ was not called to be a carnal priest. Paul says, "For if He were on earth, He should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the law." Christ's priesthood, then, is spiritual. If Christ is called to be a priest after the order of Melchisedec, then Melchisedec's priesthood is spiritual, and not carnal. This is the great point of difference between Christ and Aaron.

9*th*, Melchisedec was a type—Christ, not a type.

Against such overwhelming proof as this, is it not strange that men should have ever formed the erroneous idea that Melchisedec was not Christ?

I think that one cause of this prevalent error has been that our theology teaches that Christ was baptized by John. They have found some analogy between this circumstance and the anointing received by Aaron's sons. But the analogy is broken, crumbles to dust, the moment that we consider that Christ was not a priest on earth. Christ's priesthood is eternal, in a tabernacle not made by hands.

Were Melchisedec a mere man, Christ could not be a priest after his order. The idea is contrary to all Scripture. He could not be called a priest after the order of a man living in Abraham's time, any more than He could be called to the priesthood after the order of Pope Pius the IX.

Christ was a Priest, called, chosen and anointed after the order of Melchisedec, before Abraham was born. His priesthood is as eternal as His own eternal throne, not alone through a future eternity, but through a past eternity as well. He has been King of Salem for ever. A Priest not made after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life. (Verses 24 to 26.)

He offered one sacrifice. What sacrifice did the imaginary man, Melchisedec, offer? Was it one supreme antitypical sacrifice, or was it many typical ones, *after the order of Aaron?* "He by the grace of God tasted death for every man." "He, by one offering of Himself, hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified."

"Having, therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which He has consecrated for us, let us draw near with a true heart and full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." This is symbolical language of the washing of our souls with the water of life. He stands before the mercy seat and ever liveth.

VI. CHRIST A KING.

"Thine eyes shall see the King in His beauty; they shall behold the land that is very far off."—ISAIAH xxxiii. 17. (Read 2 Chron. xxxii.)

SOME have supposed that this prophecy referred to Hezekiah's restoration after the destruction of the Assyrian army, as I read to you in the introductory chapter. It is a matter of little consequence to us what was the literal, direct object of the prophecy. We know very well that it refers to a time when Israel's king was depressed and afterwards exalted. Indirectly it is a prophecy of Christ's humiliation and exaltation.

Many of the earliest prophecies of Scripture represent Christ as a King. That personage who presented himself to Abraham under the name of Melchisedec was no doubt Christ Himself.

Abraham could pay no tribute to any petty king. That would be to recognize his authority over a portion of the land which God had given by solemn covenant to himself. But it is objected that he was made like unto the Son of God. Yes, in the same sense that the Angel of the Covenant was like unto the Son of Mary. "Like unto" has a deeper meaning. Christ is often referred to as a king. David says, "The Lord is our defence, and the Holy One of Israel is our King.

In the prophecy of Zechariah we find such language as the following: "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem; behold thy King cometh unto thee; He is just and

having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt, the foal of an ass." These words were quoted by the evangelists, and applied to Christ. At His birth, wise men came from the east inquiring, "Where is He that is born King of the Jews." At His crucifixion, Pilate asked Him, "Art Thou a king?" Then the First Person of the Trinity is represented as saying to Jesus, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever." "He is the King of kings and Lord of lords."

"Thine eyes shall behold the land." The land of Canaan is here directly referred to;—compared with Egypt and Babylon, a land flowing with milk and honey; free from Babylon's idolatry; free from Egypt's bondage and darkness; a land of rest after they had toiled through the burning sands of the desert; a land of victorious conquest; a land in which the magnificent temple was erected in which God revealed His glory to man.

But an hour of depression has come. A foreign king sits upon the throne. This king exacts a heavy tribute, which he pays to the Roman empire. The country is filled with tax-gatherers. Their merchants are scattered in foreign countries. Other temples have been built. Their sons are fighting as soldiers in Cæsar's army. A golden eagle—symbol of Satan's empire—has been hung up in the inside, and over the temple gate. Their very money bears the image and superscription of Cæsar. Theatres have been built, and filled with unclean beasts. Pollution is everywhere present. They could not even go to the market without coming in contact with Gentile

soldiers. Dogs were allowed to collect around the houses of their rich men, and their hill sides were polluted with herds of swine.

During this period there appeared among them a young man, followed by a few ignorant fishermen, and waited upon by a few obscure women. He observed the law carefully, but paid no respect to the learned sanctimonious priesthood; never entered Herod's house but once in His life, and then was carried to Pilate's hall. He ate with publicans and sinners. Appeared to have no important business on hand, or object in view, except that of healing a few sick persons belonging to the common herd. True, He read and explained to them Moses and the prophets; but He did it in a sort of mystical way that no one had ever thought of before. In fact, He was nothing but a heretic. His mode of explaining the Scriptures completely ruined their ideas of universal empire and untold wealth. This was their true legitimate King. He who should have been seated upon David's throne had not where to lay His head. What! not willing to let Him repose in peace in His own kingdom! No; nor were they even willing to allow Him to breathe the free air of heaven. Imagining that He might possibly claim that which was justly His own by birthright, by creation and redemption, they assembled around Pilate's hall, crying, "Away with Him; crucify Him; we have no king but Cæsar." And soon a crowd gathers without the gates of Jerusalem. Roman soldiers are there. Proud scribes and haughty priests. A few disciples are now scattered over the

hills in the distance, like sheep without a pastor. A crowd of weeping women stand around. We draw near. What is all this excitement? we inquire. They tell us. Two thieves and an outcast blasphemer are suffering the extreme penalty of the law. One of them wears a crown—horrible mockery in the hour of death. It is made of the *acanthus*—a thorny plant with which fools were crowned in derision. But there is an inscription over His head. We must draw very near before we can read it, for the sun has drawn a mantle over his face. It is written in three languages. It is "Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews." And as we read, we hear the sufferer exclaim, "It is finished." Yes! Satanic malignity and human malice have done their utmost. Then comes the soldier with bloody spear. The last nail has been driven. Then the night comes,—dark night,—and another company gathers there. They take the body down from the cross. These in turn are followed by Roman officers, who set the seal of the Roman empire upon His grave. And Satan triumphs!

Now let us turn to another scene. In a large city, one of the largest cities in the known world, the capital of a mighty empire, there is a most wonderful commotion. A king is about to be crowned. Vespasian (Cæsar) has returned from his conquests, and is about to take his seat upon the imperial throne. The whole Roman world is moved. The triumphal procession sweeps by, composed of bands of martial music; a long train of captives—strong

men taken in battle; a host of weeping women; cars loaded with gold and silver; idols made of gold and decked with precious stones; the members of the royal family; an immense army in burnished armor. The king is crowned!

Another company is gathered in an upper room in Jerusalem. Some of those who stood around the cross are there. A rushing sound is heard. A dozen tongues of flame descend, and a dozen hearts are open for their reception. A King is crowned in the hearts of His disciples. Since the beginning of the world has any one ever heard of such a coronation?

God breathed upon the army of Assyria, and it perished. Upon Rome His judgments have fallen. Eighteen centuries have rolled away, and where are the crucifiers of our Lord? The Roman empire has vanished. Herod's throne is vacant. The temple and its admirers have perished.

The kingdom established on the day of Pentecost has filled the earth. Ten thousand times ten thousand on this Sabbath day bow the knee to King Emmanuel.

"Lift up your heads, O ye gates; and be ye lifted up, ye everlasting doors; and the King of glory shall come in. Who is this King of glory? The Lord, strong and mighty; the Lord, mighty in battle. Lift up your heads, O ye gates; even lift them up, ye everlasting doors, and the King of glory shall come in. Who is this King of glory? The Lord of Hosts, He is the King of glory."

Another coronation shall be witnessed. A throne resting upon a sea of crystal shall be the seat of this King; His crown a coronet of shining worlds. To the King eternal, the only wise God, be all honor and glory, for ever and ever. Amen.

VII. OUR HIGH PRIEST.—No. 1.

"For we have not an High Priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need."—HEB. iv. 15, 16. (Read Heb. iv. 12, to the end of chapter five.)

THE text which we have chosen for our consideration this morning owes its value to the fact that Jesus Christ is God. Without the divinity of Christ He could be no Priest for us. The only value attached to the Aaronic priesthood is, that it was a shadow and type of a priesthood that could remove sin. This the Aaronic priesthood could not do. In order that Christ should remove sin, He must be divine. Anything short of this, unless typical, must be but a gross deception, and we are still in our sins. But at the same time, Christ being divine, in order to have power to remove our sins, He must also be human, in order that we may know that He can sympathize with us.

At a very early period in the history of the Christian Church there was a party which held the view that Christ was divine, but that the divinity only re-

sided in the man Jesus. That is, that His body was human, but that His soul was divine—a divine soul moving and actuating a human body. This view was condemned by the Church as a heresy.

This view does not correspond with the language of Scripture, which speaks of the Eternal Word as being "made flesh," not that He "clothed" Himself with our humanity, as we would put on or lay aside a dress, but that the Son of God became the Son of man in the most perfect and complete meaning of the word—sin only excepted. This, then, leads us to the conclusion that "Christ became man by taking to Himself a true body and a reasonable soul."

We find, then, in Christ a High Priest who could be touched with a feeling of our infirmities. Being man, He wept at the tomb of the dead Lazarus; being man, He suffered with hunger in the wilderness; being man, He was wearied with the journey through Samaria, and seated Himself to rest by the well at Sychar; being man, He thirsted on the cross; being man, he selected one out of the twelve disciples to be His bosom companion; being man, He suffered in the garden of Gethsemane, in anticipation of the terrible agony He was about to endure on the cross. Thus we see manifested in the life of Christ, not only those physical sufferings which pertain to the human body, but also those emotions which pertain to the human soul, such as love, grief, fear, friendship, compassion, tenderness, and anguish.

Nor yet, on the other hand, are we to understand that Christ became man only for a limited time, and

then returned to His former condition. We are not to understand that Christ possessed no connection with our humanity until born of the Virgin Mary, and that He again laid aside the humanity after, or in either His resurrection or ascension. All the patriarchs and prophets were saved through the merits of the *Lamb* slain from the foundation of the world. When Christ speaks of His own descent from heaven, and of His ascent thither again, He does not speak of the "Son of God" as descending from heaven, but of the Son of man. It was the Son of man who came down from heaven. "What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where He was before?" This certainly shows that there was a most intimate relationship between the Son of God and the Son of man long before the wise men from the east came to worship the new-born babe of Bethlehem, although with our finite comprehension we may not be able to define clearly that relationship.

Now, it is this humanity in Christ which gives value to our religion; it is the golden chain which unites us with Deity. Were it not for this, God, to us, would be a great moral iceberg, with which we could never come in contact without being frozen. We would be separated from Him by an immense, unfathomable gulf; and even supposing that we could keep His law in all its perfection, we would receive no smile of approbation. All would be cold, cold—fathomless, unapproachable! And the moment we broke that law, God's anger would consume us. God would then become to us a consuming fire.

But when we know that there dwells in the very

bosom of Deity itself a sympathizing humanity—a great High Priest who knows and sympathizes with us in all our temptations and sorrows, being touched with a feeling of our infirmities, and who has been tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin—we can come boldly to the throne of grace, as a child would come to its own mother, expecting that sympathy and love which it could find nowhere else.

Now, we are told that Christ was "tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin." This indicates that His was a perfect humanity, or it could not be subject to temptation. An acid applied to silver may test it, prove whether it is genuine silver or a false coin; but the same acid applied to gold would be no test. Another and a different acid is here used, and if the gold be mixed with alloy the beautiful bright yellow color is at once exchanged for a dirty green. So the temptations to which our Great High Priest was exposed must be of the same nature to which our entire humanity is subject. Christ, then, being man, was subject to all the temptations to which we are exposed. Christ, then, in being made man, took upon Himself all the attributes of our sinful, fallen nature, and was tempted in all things like as we are; and then, on the other hand, the divine nature reveals itself in the apostle's concluding words, "yet without sin." He was "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners." And again He says of Himself: "The prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in Me." All the Satanic darts of temptation were blunted the moment they came in contact with the heart of Christ.

Now, again, we are told that "Christ *suffered*, being tempted." Suffering under temptation is not sin. Christ in the wilderness suffered from hunger. There was no sin in that; but if He had used His divine power to prepare bread and feed Himself, as He fed five thousand with miraculous bread, or provide Himself with wine as He provided miraculous wine for the invited guests at Cana of Galilee, there would have been sin then. His mission was to fulfil His Father's will in suffering temptation for our humanity, and He could not infringe on the Father's will without sin, and the Son of man must suffer hunger; yes, the heavens must fall before He could in any wise go contrary to His Father's will. Here was the tempter's power in endeavoring to persuade Him to gratify the carnal desire rather than obey the Divine will when it ran contrary to it.

The tempter may have said: "Here, you were born with this desire to eat when you are hungry. If you do not eat, life will be endangered, and disease and death follow. Then make bread of these stones, and satisfy this desire which God Himself has implanted in your nature."

The natural desires which God has implanted in the heart of man are not sinful. "Be ye angry, and sin not," is the language of the inspired penman. Sin is the gratification of desires that are forbidden. When resentment passes into retaliation and revenge, it becomes sin.

Sin, then, you understand, is not the carnal desires which God has implanted in man, but the *absence* of a moral power in man to control those

desires, and bring them into subjection to God's will. When we speak of total depravity, do not understand that we mean that man's natural desires are totally depraved, but the utter absence of a divine principle that will control those desires. I may better illustrate this question by comparing man to a ship at sea. The ship in its whole construction may be perfect; there may be no leak; all the timbers are sound. She is well put together; every sail, and rope, and cord is in its proper place. The sails may be said to be the passions implanted in man's heart. The prince of the power of the air, that worketh in the children of disobedience, sends his winds—temptations—that come in gentle breezes or terrific storms, to carry the vessel onward, either to the safe harbor or to destruction. This is the condition in which Adam left our race; but this is not total depravity. Total depravity is the absence of a pilot, who, knowing the temper of the winds, knows how to use them to his advantage, and steer the ship to the port of safety. That pilot the natural man has not. The *law* is not that pilot. The law is the chart which tells where the danger lies. It points out the sunken rocks, and shows the coral reefs, and the shoals and breakers; but it can do nothing to guide the ship on its course.

One thing, and one alone, of inestimable value, was left to man in the fall, but that cannot save him. The compass, that unerring needle which ever points to the north pole of man's destiny—the conscience—unless seared by a hot iron, will ever tell man when he is in the wrong. I repeat, that the con-

science cannot save man; it can only tell him that his vessel is out of the right course, and consequently warn him that he is in a dangerous condition; it cannot save him.

If you insist that the doctrine of total depravity denies the survival of any germ of celestial origin through the ruins of the fall, then I must say that your doctrine is not mine, and that I do not so understand God's Word. The Bible teaches, and experience teaches, that the conscience is a celestial germ, implanted in man with his birth.

Our comparison here is imperfect, from the fact that the ship must travel many long leagues before she comes to the end of her journey. The journey of life may be a very short one. It may consist but of the brief days of the child, or the few fleeting years of youth. Nor is the vessel wrecked at the hour of death. The human soul is wrecked when the compass is destroyed—when it rises in rebellion, and destroys the only remnant of the Divine image.

This morning I can but treat of the condition of the soul under the Old Covenant; and oh! I wish I could make the whole as plain to you as I see it myself.

The whole teaching of the Old Covenant shows that there was a falling away. Paul says of Israel passing through the Red sea, "For some when they had heard did provoke; howbeit not all that came out of Egypt by Moses." All the quibbling in the world will not change the condition of Saul. Samuel says to Saul, "The Spirit of the Lord will come upon thee;" and again, "God is with thee." The first

chapter of Isaiah is an unanswerable argument: "Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth, for the Lord hath spoken. I have nourished and brought up children." What can be more emphatic than this: "Zion is left as a cottage in a vineyard, as a lodge in a garden of cucumbers."

All of Christ's parables having reference to the Old Covenant teach the same thing. It is inscribed on every page of the Old Testament.

Under the Old Testament there was falling away, there was repentance and a turning back, and there was falling away again. The Old Covenant was not limited to youth.

A great, I may say a monstrous, error in our theology is, that we look upon such men as David as standing higher than Paul. I would not exchange my condition to-day for that of David. But did not David compose the penitential psalms, and do they not reveal the condition of David's heart? I answer, No. The sublimest prophecy given to the world was by Balaam.

So far, we present to you the condition of the Old Covenant. And what is the result. A certain infidel writer wrote a book and called it "Volney's Ruins." Read the history of Israel as presented to us in the Old Testament and Josephus, and we may call it the ruins of the Old Covenant. Glance through this panoramic view, from Genesis to Malachi, and then end with Josephus; stand and gaze upon the shores of that panoramic river as it rolls down through the ages, from Adam to the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, and you see nothing but

one great mass of colossal ruins, like the fossiliferous rocks that line the eastern shores of the Pacific Ocean, cast up from the grave of an antediluvian world.

Without a pilot, one vessel in a hundred may drift to a harbor of safety; and so, as we glance through the pages of Old Testament history, how many of the family of ancient Israel have proved faithful unto the end, and oh! how many millions have left their bones to whiten in the wilderness of Sinai.

In our next discourse, we shall consider the course of the vessel, with our Great High Priest as pilot at the helm.

VIII. THE GREAT HIGH PRIEST.—No. 2.

"For we have not a high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need."—HEBREWS iv. 15, 16. (Read Hebrews viii., and x. 15–31.)

HAVING considered the condition of Israel under the Old Covenant as a ship without the pilot at the helm, but merely guided by human instrumentality, let us now consider the condition of the New Covenant Church when Christ's promise to His disciples is fulfilled: "I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Comforter, that He may abide with you for ever." "The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in My name, He

shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." That Comforter proceeds from the Father and the Son. Possessing all the attributes of the Father, He also possesses those of the Son, and consequently standing to-day pilot of the New Covenant ship, we behold in His image the Great High Priest of our profession, who can be touched with a feeling of our infirmities.

You may ask, "What is the difference between the Holy Spirit under the Old Covenant and the Holy Spirit under the New?" I answer, that the Holy Spirit under the Old Covenant is the magnetic needle, warning of danger; the Holy Spirit under the New Covenant is the pilot at the helm, steering the vessel to a port of safety.

Hearer, did you ever consider how much we are indebted to human sympathy for the little happiness we enjoy? I know of no worse condition in which a man can be placed than to have no one to sympathize with him. Even the martyr in the flames was conscious that some one in the gaping crowd sympathized with him, even though he dare not make it known; and consciousness of the sympathy of God and angels made him endure the most excruciating torments with fortitude.

Even the prisoner in his dungeon, knowing that he has the sympathy of friends without, can endure his imprisonment with resignation; but to live in the world without sympathy, to move among others a cold, frozen iceberg in a frosty, waveless sea, without ever coming in contact with a single ray of sun-

shine from any tender, sympathizing heart, is but to exist like a skeleton in a graveyard among the silent dead.

Suppose a traveller, passing through a foreign land, unable to speak the language of the country, travelling solitary and alone, or if with others, with those whose language he cannot understand, who look upon him as an enemy, who show him no signs of sympathy, and who recognize none of his emotions, how lonely he becomes! But let a fellow traveller join him—a native of his own country—who speaks his own language, with whom he can converse freely about his voyage; what they expect to find at the end of their journey, and about ten thousand things of interest, and oh! how soon the bond of sympathy becomes strong between them. They have found in each other a brother.

Now let us apply this to our ship driven before the winds of temptation on the stormy sea of life. The chart and the compass have pointed out our danger, and in the dim distance we see the shore white with the bones of a mighty host. Suddenly, like an angel from heaven, a pilot appears at the helm. We speak to Him, and He knows our language. We take hold of Him, and we find that He is of our humanity. We ask Him about the chart, and He knows the law; not a foot of that rocky shore but His bleeding feet have trod; not a crag among all those sharp pointed rocks which has not pierced His tender hands; not a sound which He has not fathomed, nor a gulf into which He has not plunged; in fact, He headed the survey and drew

the chart from His own soundings. Talk to Him about the compass, and He knows the philosophy of it all. Tell Him about the land of your birth, and He knows it all, for He Himself was born there. Ask Him about the grave, and He can tell you all about it, for He has been through the grave. Ask Him about the world to which you are going, and He will tell you about all worlds, for He made them. Are you suffering pain, look at His pierced hands. Are you in terrible mental anguish, look at His bleeding side, and remember Gethsemane. Are you mocked by the world, look at His purple robe and crown of thorns. Oh! we have a "great High Priest who can be touched by a feeling of our infirmities, and was tempted in all things like as we are, yet without sin."

Now, in order to obtain the blessings of the New Covenant, we must put ourselves in sympathy with Christ. We must look upon those pierced hands and feet, and feel the nails piercing our flesh also. We must look upon that bleeding side, and feel the spear as it penetrates our heart; and as we see Him mocked with a purple robe and crown of thorns, we must take up His cross and follow after Him.

Again, we are disposed to imagine that Christ sympathizes with our humanity, and not with us as individuals. This is a great mistake. Christ sympathizes as much to-day with each one of my hearers as He did with the five thousand that He fed with loaves and fishes. If there is an erring Peter or doubting Thomas here to-night, Christ sympathizes with him. If there is some small, insignificant

Zaccheus here to-night, who would get a better view of his risen Lord, Christ invites him to open the door of his heart, and He will come in and sup with him. Is there some poor despised woman of Canaan here who craves but a crumb from the Master's table, she shall be fed abundantly. Is there some poor forsaken one here who can but press through the crowd, and only touch the hem of His garment, she shall be healed from all the infirmities of the soul. "Let us therefore," brethren, "come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need."

Again, we are comforted with the human and the divine natures of Jesus. If Jesus were but a man, He could be no judge of sinners. David could not judge. When he supposed that he was judging another man for a crime which he himself had committed, he said, "He shall surely die." The men who brought an adulterous woman to Christ would have stoned her to death without mercy, and in the end proved themselves equally guilty. Should we be allowed to condemn ourselves, under the supposition that we were condemning our worst enemies, I fear we would shame Torquemada and the Spanish Inquisition. But we have a Judge who is divine; seated not in Moses' seat, supported by the ten commandments, but upon a throne of grace, supported by the everlasting gospel, proclaiming "Peace and good will to men."

"*To find grace to help in time of need.*" Oh! what a world of meaning there is in these words. Are you tempted above all other men? Has Satan

so woven his coils around you that he is dragging you down with giant force to a drunkard's grave and perhaps a drunkard's hell? Go to the throne of grace, and find help in time of need.

Has the infidel, with spider-like cunning, been weaving his subtile philosophy over your brain until you swim in a sea of doubts, gasping, struggling, quivering? Go to the throne of grace, and find help in time of need.

Have worldly cares so swallowed up your life that you feel your moral nature cramped, dwarfed, ignorant of God's word, and ignorant of the gospel plan of salvation? Go to a throne of grace, and find help in time of need. "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not, and it shall be given him."

Are you suffering in body, racked with physical pain? Does the burning fever rack your temples, and send the hot blood pulsating through your veins? Go to a throne of grace, and find help in time of need.

Has the world turned a cold shoulder upon you? are you afflicted with poverty and want? do sorrow and care weigh you down, and has life become a burden almost too great to bear? Go to a throne of grace, and find help in time of need.

Has the cold hand of death thrust itself between you and some beloved one—removing a father, mother, brother, sister, wife, or child—and left the blooming Eden to you a cold, barren wilderness of ice? Go to a throne of grace, and find help in time of need.

Have Satan and all the armies of hell pursued you,

like Pharoah and his host, down into the great Red sea of death? Go to a throne of grace, and find grace to help in time of need. And behold, a way will open up before you, even through the grave, and the Angel of the Covenant will follow you, receiving all the fiery darts of the enemy into His own bosom.

"Let us, then, come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need."

IX. THE LABORERS IN THE VINEYARD.

"So the last shall be first, and the first last; for many be called, but few chosen."—MATT. xx. 16.

OUR Bible was divided into chapters and verses in modern times. The proper divisions made by the authors themselves are designated by paragraphs. The last four verses of the nineteenth chapter belong to the twentieth chapter. Isolated as it stands now, a superficial reader would get a very erroneous meaning from the parable. In fact, the great majority of Bible readers suppose that the meaning is, that God calls people at all ages of life, and that those who begin to serve Him after a long life of sin will be rewarded the same as those who begin to serve the Lord in early youth. Such is not the meaning of the parable. Our Lord never intended to convey to the minds of the disciples any such idea as this.

The proper meaning of this parable can only be

obtained by a careful examination of the circumstances which preceded it, and which induced our Lord to present it to His disciples.

First, we have a young nobleman presenting himself to our Lord, and inquiring what he should do that he might inherit eternal life. This rich young man's affections were placed upon the riches of this world, and as he goes away sorrowful when told to sell his property and give to the poor, our Lord turns to His disciples and says to them, "How hard it is for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven!" Then Peter, who appears to have been the spokesman for all the disciples, says, "Behold, we have forsaken all and followed Thee; what shall we have therefore?" Then our Lord pronounced these remarkable words: "Verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed Me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of His glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Then He adds, "But many that are first shall be last, and the last shall be first. For the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is an householder." In the original Greek the thirtieth verse of the nineteenth chapter, and first verse of the twentieth chapter, are all one sentence; there is not even a capital letter to divide the sentence.

The *day* in which these laborers worked in the vineyard is not the day of life, but the day of the first covenant, whose night was now approaching. The sun, moon, and stars of that covenant were soon to be darkened, according to the prophecies. The night was approaching; this was already the eleventh

hour. The night set in when our Savior hung upon the cross.

I think that the whole solution of this parable is in the fact that it is an answer to the question asked by the disciples in the beginning of the eighteenth chapter, "Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?" and now referred to again by the second question on the same subject, "What shall we have therefore?" the answer to the first being unsatisfactory to the disciples.

Many imagine that the kingdom of heaven is like a tree—first a large trunk, out of which grow great branches, and then smaller branches from these, and so on down, continually decreasing in size. The patriarchs were the trunk, the Israelites called from Egypt the branches, and so on down, till in Christ's time the disciples would be but small twigs.

The minds of the disciples, like the scribes and Pharisees, were filled with the idea of a temporal kingdom. To them it was a matter of great importance what position they should occupy. The scribes and Pharisees claim to be the old trunk. What, then, can the disciples be but small branches? Now He tells them that those who follow Him all the way through the regeneration—that is, through the grave, into the new kingdom—shall sit on twelve thrones; and that many that are last shall be first, and the first last. How is this?

One important lesson taught by the tree and its branches must not be lost sight of. The old trunk is near the earth, the branches nearest heaven, and even the smallest twigs reign over the trunk as well

as the large branches; just as Christ said of John the Baptist, "Verily, I say unto you, Among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist: notwithstanding, he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he."

Christ expressed the same idea to His disciples at the well of Samaria: "Say not ye, There are yet four months, and then cometh harvest? behold, I say unto you, Lift up your eyes, and look on the fields; for they are white already to harvest. And he that reapeth receiveth wages, and gathereth fruit unto life eternal; that both he that soweth and he that reapeth may rejoice together. And herein is that saying true, One soweth, and another reapeth. I sent you to reap that whereon ye bestowed no labor: other men labored, and ye are entered into their labors."

You will observe that the householder went out early in the morning; then again at the third, sixth, ninth, and eleventh hours. Early in the morning of Israel's history He called laborers into His vineyard by Moses and the law. Then again He called them by judges and kings. Then at mid-day He sent His prophets to call laborers. And now, at the eleventh hour, He sends John the Baptist and His own disciples. Now, which of these called shall obtain the most prominent position in His kingdom?

"For the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is a householder, which went out early in the morning to hire laborers into his vineyard. And when he had agreed with the laborers for a penny a

day, he sent them into his vineyard." He agrees to pay a penny—a day's wages, supposing a penny to be about one dollar of our money. He makes a bargain with them, and holds them to their bargain.

"And he went out about the third hour, and saw others standing idle in the marketplace, and said unto them, Go ye also into the vineyard, and whatsoever is right I will give you. And they went their way. Again he went out about the sixth and ninth hour, and did likewise. And about the eleventh hour he went out, and found others standing idle, and saith unto them, Why stand ye here all the day idle? They say unto him, Because no man hath hired us. He saith unto them, Go ye also into the vineyard; and whatsoever is right, that shall ye receive." All labor that is not in Christ's vineyard is, in His sight, "standing idle."

"*No man hath hired us*" cannot be applied to the Jews, who knew the will of the Lord, and would clearly indicate the *Gentile world.* No such answer as this can be given to-day by people living in Christian lands and laboring in Satan's vineyard. Gospel ministers are everywhere employed in hiring laborers for the Lord's vineyard.

"So when even was come, the lord of the vineyard saith unto his steward, Call the laborers, and give them their hire, beginning from the last unto the first." This was according to the Jewish law, to pay every man at nightfall: "At his day thou shalt give him his hire, neither shall the sun go down upon it." We very much need some such law as this in some of the upper branches of the Christian church.

A few wholesome Jewish laws like this would be a great improvement on our boasted Christianity.

"And when they came that were hired about the eleventh hour, they received every man a penny. But when the first came, they supposed that they should have received more; and they likewise received every man a penny. And when they had received it, they murmured against the goodman of the house, saying, These last have wrought but one hour, and thou hast made them equal unto us, which have borne the burden and heat of the day." The reward given is *eternal life.* God said to Abraham, "I am thy exceeding great reward." This is the reward given to all.

"But he answered one of them, and said, Friend, I do thee no wrong: didst not thou agree with me for a penny? Take that thine is, and go thy way: I will give unto this last, even as unto thee. Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own? Is thine eye evil, because I am good?" The "friend" here is probably one of the most importunate.

I think that the whole force of the parable is to show that those who are called into the new kingdom of Christ under the New Covenant, although occupying a later and easier position, receive the same reward with the faithful Jews called under the law.

"So the last shall be first, and the first last: for many be called, but few chosen." These are called last, but they come in first. The others are *called* to God's kingdom as *servants;* these are chosen for Christ's spiritual kingdom as a spiritual priesthood. The Jews may murmur because they were called

first, and, as it appears, are going to be the last to enter the kingdom.

God does not reward men according to the amount of labor they accomplish in His vineyard. Nor do *we pay men* according to the amount of labor, but according to the value of their labor. If we build a house, we may pay the man who digs the cellar fifty cents a day; the mason who lays the foundation, one dollar a day; the carpenter who does common carpenter work, two dollars; the one who does ornamental work, three dollars; and the architect, ten dollars; and yet each one receives the just value of his labor. Nor is any injustice done. The man who digs the cellar never spent an hour's time in learning his trade, while the architect may have spent half a lifetime in learning his. The clerk or bookkeeper may have prepared himself for his occupation by two or three years' study, while the minister in the pulpit may have gone through a course of study occupying twenty or thirty years. Would it be right that each receive the same wages? Now God knows all these differences, and rewards each and all according to His infinite view of justice, and not according to the superficial view of a day laborer who does not even know what it costs to learn the multiplication table.

Again, what were ages in the Jewish dispensation are only different positions under the Christian dispensation. You of the different calls are all arranged in these pews before me. I do not know the positions in God's kingdom that you occupy, but He does; and by the light of His Word I can describe the

various positions you may occupy. There is one who was called in infancy; he was dedicated to God by a symbol of Christian baptism; his parents baptized him with the word. This one was called in the morning early. To-day, where is he? Everything connected with his religion may be counted on the ends of your fingers: he can repeat the Lord's Prayer, the Apostle's Creed, the Ten Commandments, and twenty or thirty questions and answers in the Shorter Catechism; has an idea of the life of Christ and the Acts of the Apostles; he plods on year after year, contented with what he knows. A bad man you cannot call him, for he injures no one, and you may say he does no one any good. He just vegetates from year to year, with a name to live. This is one of the first.

Another was called a little later. He styles himself a convert. He does not understand infant baptism, and does not want to understand it; thinks that none but adult believers should be admitted into the vineyard; that is, that none will receive pay but those who were called when he was and as he was. He is faithful, hoeing away just four rows from the door, and there he will hoe till sundown. To him the church is not a place of improvement, but a place where he can "feel good;" and when he sees a brother returning from meeting, he does not inquire, "How much did you learn about Christ and His kingdom?" but "Did you have a good time?"

But here are others, called at the eleventh hour, and soon they are chosen to a higher position. Poor fishermen they are when called; at last we see them

seated upon thrones, judging the first called. Millions are called to be servants, but few are chosen to be kings. Oh! I wish I could implant in the breasts of each one of you a desire to be stars of the first magnitude.

RD 84

Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: May 2005

PreservationTechnologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION
111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

DOBBS BROS.
LIBRARY BINDING
JUL 81
ST. AUGUSTINE
FLA.
32084

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 014 242 025 9